



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 9, 2014

No. 5

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MESSER).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 9, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable LUKE MESSER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING AWARENESS DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday on January 11, people throughout our country here, people throughout the world will be observing Human Trafficking Awareness Day. The start of this new year I think is a fitting time to focus on the shameful fact that human slavery is not a relic of ancient history, that in fact it is with us today. It is a brutal reality. A reality faced by more than 20 million victims around

the world, many of them trafficked for labor, but increasingly for underaged girls. For young women, this is a case where they are exploited in this trafficking as well.

Even in my work as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I have learned that human trafficking is no longer just a problem "over there." It is a problem in our communities here. It is a problem in developing economies, but also it is a problem in the United States and in Europe. It is a scourge even in the communities that we serve here and that we represent.

In my own community in the last two years, the Orange County Human Trafficking Task Force assisted 250 victims. Ninety-three percent were women, most of them underage, 80 of them from foreign countries. At our November field hearing in Fullerton, the Orange County district attorney testified that, shockingly—we are speaking now about trafficking, sexual trafficking—"shockingly the average age of a child being trafficked in this country is 12" years of age. "A little girl who has not even reached her teens."

We also heard from one brave survivor, Angela Guanzon, who was trafficked from the Philippines into forced labor in Long Beach, California.

I have heard many other stories from the members of the Human Trafficking Congressional Advisory Committee that I established last year in my Los Angeles district office. The forum for communicating on trafficking between law enforcement, advocates, service organizations, and survivors has contributed profoundly to my own knowledge, my own understanding of this issue. I encourage my colleagues to get to know those on the front lines of the fight against human trafficking. Get to know them in their districts and know of their work. You are going to be informed, challenged, and inspired by what you learn.

This January designated as National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month is a perfect time to shine a spotlight on the dark issue of trafficking, but awareness is only a first step. More needs to be done.

To that end, I would urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring H.R. 3344, the Fraudulent Overseas Recruitment and Trafficking Elimination Act, to combat one critical form of recurring abuse: namely, that is unscrupulous recruiters. By targeting the recruiters we can do a lot—these recruiters who bait foreigners to travel to the United States with promises of good jobs, but trap them in sexual exploitation or forced labor once they arrive.

For example, in my home county, the Salvation Army's Network of Emergency Trafficking Services reports that a full one-third of their clients—33 percent of their clients—were recruited in a foreign country by a labor recruiter. They got here and found it was a very different job than the one they enlisted for. This represents not only an assault on the dignity of the victim but also a subversion of United States labor laws and our nonimmigrant visa system.

In response, this legislation requires that prospective foreign workers be given accurate information about the terms of employment and be given anti-trafficking protections by U.S. laws. It prohibits recruitment fees or hidden charges used as coercive leverage against workers. In other words, once you get here to the United States, you can't find out afterwards, because they didn't disclose to you, that there are fees that you owe. Those fees are no longer allowed. Up front the employer pays those fees.

It requires foreign labor recruiters to register and remain in good standing with the Department of Labor, and it provides new incentives and enforcement mechanisms to ensure that recruiters and employers follow these disclosure and registration requirements.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

Members may contact the Foreign Affairs Committee to join this important anti-traffic initiative. I encourage you all to sign on to my legislation.

As people of goodwill around the world observe Human Trafficking Awareness Day this weekend, let us move beyond mere awareness, let us abolish this injustice, and protect and restore the dignity of those who have survived such exploitation.

INTERIM AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, our interim agreement with Iran gives us an opportunity to unwind seemingly intractable, interrelated conflicts throughout the Middle East.

There is no reason for Congress to complicate by further enhancing sanctions now that are already working. We have this 6 months to a year window to fashion a longer-term agreement. The fact that we are even talking with Iran is the most encouraging signal that we have seen in 34 years. Let's use this diplomatic window. There are hard-liners in both countries, highly suspicious, very negative, who would like to blow this agreement up.

Unless we are willing to invade and occupy Iran, even repeated bombing will delay the Iranian nuclear effort by, at best, 4 or 5 years, maybe less.

Americans have spent a trillion dollars, lost 4,000 American lives, with tens of thousands of wounded, in more than a decade in Iraq, and the country is still falling apart. Iran is bigger, stronger, and more sophisticated. I don't think you can sell that war to the American people.

Congress should calm down and give diplomacy a chance. Let's learn about this important country, its 4,000-year history, and our past mistakes with Iran, and most important, our common interest.

The Middle East has long been a simmering cauldron, with a conflict suppressed by a lid of repression held down by empire and colonial powers. That started to change a century ago with the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, and colonial powers trying from afar to influence human behavior by drawing lines on maps from European capitals, irrespective of religious, tribal, or ethnic realities. It set in motion a series of forces that are playing out today with tragic consequences.

Iran as the dominant Shi'a force in the region could play a huge role where we share common interest, in Syria, Iraq, and Afghanistan for instance.

The current situation is a result of partnerships between Congress and the Obama administration that got us to this point where Iran is willing to negotiate. Strong, effective sanctions would never have worked without careful, artful diplomacy that involved other countries like India to help us

squeeze Iran. It has worked. Let's claim credit and move on to the next steps.

We could start by trying to learn about each other. Let's promote an exchange between Iran and the United States with students, religious leaders, maybe even parliamentary members and Members of Congress. Let's focus on our shared interest, like Afghanistan, where we had earlier cooperation with Iran to help overthrow the Taliban. Let's work to make progress with the agreement and beyond.

The Congress can do this most importantly by leaving it alone. Congress shouldn't meddle, Congress shouldn't muddle, Congress shouldn't give the Iranian hard-liners who don't want any agreement at all an excuse to scuttle it.

We have an opportunity to improve the most volatile region in the world and Congress shouldn't blow that opportunity.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BENEFITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, 48 hours, a million-plus Americans received letters in their mailboxes. They weren't overdue tax letters. They were not letters suggesting that you are at fault. It was not a notice to say that you are no longer an American citizen. It was not a letter to say you are now relieved of any responsibility to pay any bills or to provide for your family.

It was a letter denying, or extinguishing, taking away the unemployment insurance that most Americans have come to understand that, as working Americans, having worked in their life, that they would be the recipient of these benefits during a brief lapse or an extended lapse of not being able to find work. The chronically unemployed percentage is the highest that it has been in decades, and therefore, this is not the time to delay.

I hold in my hand as well a resume of a competent worker, a college graduate who has the responsibility to support his family and who has been looking for work for 2 years, earnestly, energetically, and intensely, and cannot find work.

The clock is ticking on the 30 hours in the United States Senate, but the real concern is my friends in this body. Recognizing that these letters deal with people's lives, and to make a representation that all is well, unemployment generally is 7 percent. However, it was lower than that when President Bush signed the unemployment insurance benefits in 2008. These guys, these distinguished Americans, misfits, why can't they find work? Twenty thousand-plus are veterans looking for work, men and women who served in the United States military, or, as we met in the White House on Tuesday, a mother of two distinguished men who are serving in Afghanistan.

So the 1.3 million languish while we are trying to make a determination that may not be able to be made. Frankly, I would ask that we all be reasonable. I would simply make the point that it is an emergency.

I want to pause for a moment and thank the Houston Apartment Association that has worked with me and has sent a letter to all of their members asking for those 12,000, some of whom are residents of apartments in Harris County, to be sensitive and tolerant of those individuals who can document that they were the beneficiaries or the recipients of unemployment insurance that was cut off on December 28. I want to applaud them for their sensitivity in dealing with those particular individuals. I ask mortgage companies and utility companies and city water bill companies to be tolerant as well, to be working with families who are basically without a lifeline.

□ 1015

But the issue before us is the fact that these letters have gone to people such as this woman, who has looked for work every day. She liked her job and was laid off for no fault of her own.

Right now, we have the opportunity to pass a 3-month emergency relief—some of us have introduced bills for 1 year—and then contemplate, discuss, and work with what might be the appropriate way of funding the continuation.

No person unemployed, chronically or not, is happy with an unemployment benefit check. What they are happy with, Mr. Speaker, is the ability to work and to provide for their family.

So I would make the argument that as we discuss privacy issues on the Affordable Care Act, which are already taken care of by CMS, today and tomorrow on the floor we should be passing unemployment insurance. I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me, recognizing that Americans want to work. Let's help them transition with a bridge of unemployment insurance.

OPPOSITION TO UNESCO FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, last November, the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Samantha Power, came to meet with my colleagues and me who serve on the Foreign Affairs Committee. In that meeting, Ambassador Power told us that despite U.S. law that prohibits any funding to UNESCO because of its decision to admit a nonexistent state of Palestine to its membership, the administration was going to make it a priority to seek waiver authority to continue U.S. taxpayer funding to UNESCO.

Indeed, this is coming to fruition. There is a congressional push by some to grant the administration this waiver

or to seek other ways to get around this prohibition.

I am here today to voice my unconditional and unyielding opposition to this push, and I urge my colleagues to join me in removing that in the budget that will be before us soon and not allow the administration to yet again circumvent U.S. law and to throw away hundreds of millions of dollars of U.S. taxpayer money.

The administration is seeking to not only restore \$80 million in taxpayer funds to UNESCO for this fiscal year, but it is also seeking to pay nearly \$250 million more in arrears—dues—that we owed to UNESCO, an agency that has an anti-U.S. and an anti-Israel agenda.

If we restore funding to UNESCO, we are tacitly agreeing with their support for Abbas, the PA, the PLO, the non-existent state of Palestine, and the U.N. scheme to undermine the peace process by granting de facto recognition to a Palestinian state without it first coming to an agreement with Israel to resolve this long conflict.

A vote to restore any U.S. funding to UNESCO or to give the administration any waiver authority to circumvent the existing laws that prohibit U.S. funding to UNESCO would not only undermine our credibility and set a dangerous precedent; it would further embolden an already intransigent Abu Mazen and Palestinian Authority.

Why do I say “intransigent”? Because even as we sit here, Mr. Speaker, reports indicate that a major holdup in the peace negotiations between Secretary Kerry, Israel, and the Palestinian Authority is the refusal by Abbas and the PA to recognize Israel as the Jewish State of Israel. Is that the kind of member that we want to be associated with in UNESCO—one that doesn't even recognize the identity of another state? And not just another state, but our closest ally.

I know that UNESCO is riddled with rogue regimes amongst its ranks, including the likes of Cuba, where the callous, brutal, and murderous Castro regime has been repressing the rights of 11 million Cubans for over half a century; and Syria, where the tyrant Assad has caused the deaths of over 130,000 people and brought the Middle East to the very brink.

But if we restore U.S. funding to UNESCO, we are essentially saying that this is okay, and, oh, by the way, why not add one more in Abbas? There has been a recent spate of terrorist activity against Israel; and rather than act like a true leader that seeks peace and a partner in a negotiated peace settlement, Abbas was definitely silent when it came time to denounce these acts of terror.

The powers that be at UNESCO don't seem to mind this at all. But not us, Mr. Speaker. We are better than that. We aren't about to trade in our credibility and our principles as a country for a plaque and platitudes for this circumvention. We know that if we concede to UNESCO and restore any fund-

ing, we would be making a grave mistake, and also wasting hundreds of millions of our constituents' dollars on this anti-U.S. agenda.

I will continue to fight this push to restore funding to UNESCO in any way, and I will continue to rally my colleagues to join me in this fight.

STRONG START FOR AMERICA'S CHILDREN ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, study after study has shown us that investment in quality early education leads to better educational outcomes, stronger job earnings, and lower crime rates. Decades of research confirm that quality preschool helps prevent achievement gaps for low-income children, with long-term benefits for our Nation.

But we don't need research to confirm the importance of quality early childhood education. Ask any parent in America if it matters to them. The problem is that not enough children have access to it. That is why I have introduced the bipartisan bill, Strong Start for America's Children Act.

When Congressman HANNA, Senator HARKIN, and I introduced the bill in November, we were joined by the sheriff of Minneapolis, a top private-sector CEO, a retired Air Force General, a parent, and Secretary of Education Arne Duncan. These leaders from so many segments of our country understand the need for greater Federal investment in high-quality preschool.

My legislation proposes an innovative Federal-State partnership to increase resources for local school districts and community-based programs that provide quality pre-kindergarten for 4-year-olds. It also allows funding for educating 3-year-olds. It also allows States to spend some of the money on good quality infant and toddler care. The bill improves child care quality for infants and toddlers by supporting partnerships between child care and Early Head Start.

Millions of young children from low-income families lack access to high-quality preschool programs and child care services. They are on waiting lists because of limited public funding. This deepens achievement gaps and impedes the Nation's economic workforce success.

For example, Early Head Start has shown to be an effective, high-quality program; yet the sad truth is that only 3 percent of the eligible children have access to it. Additionally, one in six low-income families eligible for Federal child care services has access.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a Democratic issue nor a Republican issue. Babies, toddlers, and preschoolers don't know that political parties exist. In fact, we are seeing that Republican and Democratic Governors from all regions of

the country are pushing for more funding for early learning in their States. They want to be partners with the Federal Government.

State legislators from both parties in a wide range of States have led efforts to support quality preschool. Just recently, we received a letter signed by more than 500 State legislators from both parties in support of this issue.

I am also very proud of our partnership with the fellow Republican Members of the House, such as Mr. HANNA and Mr. GRIMM. We all know that the policy makes sense for America's future. We all know what is possible in our communities and in our Nation if kids are given a fair shot at success.

The public understands and believes in early childhood education. A bipartisan poll released in July found an overwhelming majority of Americans supports quality early childhood education and rate it a national priority, second to only increasing jobs and economic growth. Seven in 10 support the Federal plan to help States and local communities provide better early childhood education.

Members of Congress and other policymakers are also getting on board. The bipartisan budget agreement reached last month includes a reserve fund for early childhood education, child care, and voluntary home visitation. That is yet another acknowledgment by another bipartisan group of Members—in this case, budget leaders—that early childhood education should be a top priority for the Federal Government. That acknowledgment is clearly a step forward, but it isn't enough. Our next step must be the enactment of the Strong Start Act.

With the fiscal year 2014 spending deadline less than a week away, I understand that appropriators from both Houses are considering increased funding for preschool, as outlined in our bipartisan bill. I heartily encourage this course.

Despite the language used whenever we in Congress talk about budgets, funding early childhood education isn't spending. It is an investment, and it is an investment that is critical for our Nation's long-term economic strength.

From a better-educated workforce to a reduced need for social services, study after study has documented the enormous return on investment of early childhood education. We can save between \$7 and \$12 for every dollar invested. These are real savings resulting from less grade repetition, lower dropout rates, less spending on welfare and social services, more tax revenue, and lower incarceration rates.

As Sheriff Rich Stanek said when we launched the Strong Start for America's Children Act:

I'm the guy you pay later.

Let's stop spending on the back end what we should be investing in the beginning in a child's life.

For all of these reasons, our bill has the support of more than 60 national organizations representing pediatricians, law enforcement, religious

groups, labor unions, business and military leaders, people with disabilities, school principals, civil rights leaders, and literacy advocates. Now is the time to empower the next generation and guarantee a better future for our Nation.

HONORING RON MILLER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to be here this morning and to share with you and our colleagues the story of an exceptional American, Ron Miller, who I am proud to say lives in Virginia's Second Congressional District, the district I have the privilege to serve and represent.

Ron is 46 years old. He had always planned to go back to school; but at age 33, his life was turned upside down. He was diagnosed with Lou Gehrig's disease, or ALS, a devastating neurodegenerative disease that progressively affects nerves in the brain and the spinal cord. It is a disease for which, at present, there is no cure.

Ron is paralyzed from the nose down; yet he used eye-gaze computer technology to complete his associate's degree in liberal arts, with honors, in a bold and courageous effort to bring attention to ALS.

They have a wonderful staff at the Lake Taylor transitional facility where Ron lives, and where the graduation ceremony took place; and I saw tears coming down several of the staff members' eyes as they watched Ron receive his degree. Actually, the president of Excelsior College made the effort to fly down to be with us that day.

I was deeply honored to be there and to have the privilege of sharing the commencement address, but it certainly wasn't my words that inspired everyone who was there. It was Ron's words that he shared through his computer.

He didn't talk about himself. He didn't talk about how difficult things are for him. He mainly thanked all of those in his life that made the degree possible. He talked about the importance of education and the importance of finding a cure for ALS.

I want to share just a small portion of what he shared that day. I watched his eyes as they guided the cursor on the screen to the "play" button. When he hit it with his eyes, it actually started the computer to speak. He put it this way:

I ask that you all bear with me as I stumble my way through this. At least I can blame the computer if I mispronounce anything.

That got a laugh there. He has got a great sense of humor.

He said:

Thank you for ensuring I started each class not as a disabled person, but as a differently abled person.

He thanked all the nurses and the nurses' aides there. He said:

You are my heroes. First of all, it takes a lot of work for me to look this good.

He has a great sense of humor.

He thanked his family and his friends for their love and support.

Speaking of life, he said:

It isn't always easy—but life never is. I just have a different set of challenges than most.

He left us with this quote by John Wooden:

Do not let what you cannot do interfere with what you can do.

Powerful words.

To me, Mr. Speaker, Ron's courage and his remarkable achievement represent the very best of the American spirit and the human spirit. It is a strong heart that chooses to be grateful for life's simple blessings, one that values the gift of friendship, one that embraces the pursuit of knowledge, and one that does not rest in a relentless pursuit to lessen human suffering, especially for those who will follow.

So I really count it as a high privilege to know Ron and to count him as a friend. He is fulfilling his mission to ensure that Americans are educated about the challenges that those with ALS face. He has also shown us what a person with ALS can accomplish.

He and many others who are heavily burdened with ALS, and their families, are calling attention to the need for improved access. We have a wonderful facility in Virginia Beach that is a tremendous asset for those who are afflicted with a disease that affects their physical mobility and that includes many of our wounded warriors.

□ 1030

It is JT's Grommet Island. It is right there on Virginia Beach, really the first on the east coast that allows people that are mobility impaired to get down and experience the joy of being on the water and the sun and the sand and just being outside.

There is a lot more work to be done, and I am so proud of our friends, Bruce Thompson and others. His son, Josh, is afflicted with ALS, and he led the effort to build that facility that I just mentioned there. It is called JT's Grommet Island, and it is named in honor of his son, Josh, who is struggling with this, and his family is as well.

I just want to close my comments today with great respect for those who are struggling with this disease and to share with you something that Ron has said about his struggle. It is an outlook on life that I found profound and inspirational, and I posted it in my home where I see it every day. He said this: "I may have ALS, but ALS does not have me."

So, Mr. Speaker, may Ron's remarkable achievement and the spirit that he exhibits in his life inspire all of us to join him in this worthy fight to find a cure for ALS.

THE 50-YEAR WAR ON POVERTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am here to speak about unemployment insurance and the extension of it to my Republican colleagues. But there is no one over here to listen, so maybe they will listen to some renowned Republicans talk about what is really important.

How about Newt Gingrich, who recently said, "I think every Republican should embrace the Pope's core critique that you do not want to live on a planet with billionaires and people who do not have any food?"

Or how about John Feehery, a Republican strategist who said, "What does the Republican Party actually believe in? What is its purpose? Is it just to have unbridled capitalism without any moral core?"

Mr. Speaker, this 50-year war on poverty has faced setbacks under the leadership of both parties, but the GOP-led House seems to be actively engaged in a war on the war on poverty. Congress' inaction has cut off 1.3 million people from unemployment insurance after Christmas and, unless renewed, will cut benefits for another 1.9 million who are eligible in 2014.

Some of my colleagues across the aisle have claimed that this is just politics, that unemployment insurance was "intended to be a temporary solution to a very temporary crisis." Well, here's a news flash. We have been in this crisis since 2008. This is not temporary. This is long-term and it is chronic, and it has been caused by the greed of billionaires of the likes that we have seen on Wall Street. This is a personal nightmare for many of the constituents of my colleagues across the aisle. Some of their constituents have written to my office because they think their Representative is blind to how they are struggling.

Now, Margaret Heffernan is a renowned speaker, and she talks about mindless blindness. And in many respects, that is what I think we are engaged in here, mindless blindness. So here are some of the stories of those impacted by the loss of unemployment insurance who live in districts of my Republican colleagues, because maybe they will hear me and think about who is being hurt by playing politics.

Payne Springs, Texas, resident Linda Mrosko shared her story with me on my congressional Facebook page. Linda was 60 years old when her legal secretary job was eliminated. With more than 40 years of work experience under her belt—this is not someone sitting on a couch at home—40 years of experience as a paralegal secretary, she believed unemployment insurance would protect her if she lost her job. Even while caring for her 80-year-old mother with breast cancer, Linda continued to look for work but got very few interviews. Her 91-year-old father then fell ill and died, but Linda continued to look for work, even while in

mourning and caring for her sick mother. The few interviews Linda does get, she is surrounded by people in their twenties and thirties and thinks that her age might be keeping her from securing a job.

"My unemployment ended on December 28. I have no savings. I haven't paid rent yet, or electricity, or the car payment, or the phone bill because I don't have enough money to make those payments," she wrote to me.

Well, Linda, I hope your Republican Congressman reaches out to you immediately to explain to you in his own words why you shouldn't have your unemployment insurance extended after being employed for 40 years in this country.

Unemployment isn't a temporary problem for Daniel Burrow of Beau-regard, Alabama. Daniel just hit his 26th week of filed unemployment. He lost his job in the auto industry in 2012 while he was on medical leave. The 45-year-old has exhausted all his unemployment benefits and applied for more than 50 jobs with no luck. His wife worries how the family will afford gas for Daniel to go job hunting or how the family will pay for necessities not covered by food stamps.

In Florida, 49-year-old Jim Lanzerio can barely pay his bills while he raises his 17-year-old daughter on his own. His unemployment insurance will run out in February, and he wonders why Congress cannot reach a deal on extending Federal emergency unemployment insurance. He has been looking for a job every day since early October and is "not sitting back and waiting. I would go back to work immediately if someone offered me a job."

This is more than politics for 70,000 individuals in Florida who already lost their unemployment insurance. These are just three stories. There are 1.3 million more that could be shared here today of people who have lost their unemployment insurance on December 28.

Yesterday was the 50th anniversary of President Johnson's announcing a war on poverty. The real question is: Why are our colleagues waging a war on the war on poverty?

THE WAR ON POVERTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commemorate the 50th anniversary of President Lyndon B. Johnson's war on poverty.

In 1964, President Johnson stood in this Chamber and addressed a Congress that represented a nation where more than 25 percent of Americans lived in poverty. In his address, President Johnson launched an agenda that led to the creation of Medicare, Medicaid, Job Corps, Head Start, and nutrition assistance for those who struggle to put food on their table.

His war, and its resulting programs, helped move millions out of poverty.

From 1967 to 2012, the poverty rate fell from 26 percent to 16 percent, largely because of the strong safety net programs initiated by President Johnson's agenda.

Yet here we are today, 50 years later, and too many Americans are still living on the outskirts of hope because the war on poverty has now become a war on the poor. In the last year alone, Congress has agreed to indiscriminate, across-the-board cuts known as sequestration in an effort to balance the budget, and the House passed a farm bill that cut SNAP by \$40 billion. Sequestration hurts the very people who need help the most by greatly reducing critical funding to programs like WIC and Head Start.

Congress drastically cut one of the most powerful antipoverty programs, SNAP, better known as food stamps. That is absurd when, according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, SNAP kept 4.9 million Americans out of poverty in 2012 alone, including 2.2 million children.

Congress has also chosen not to extend unemployment insurance. Even though our country continues to lift itself out of the recession, many Americans still need our support. Turning our back on the 1.4 million Americans who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own is unconscionable.

In an interview yesterday, I was asked to respond to a quote regarding unemployment insurance by a Republican, and this is what he said. He said:

We have to introduce the blessing of work to people who have never seen it.

And let me just say, to be clear, he could not possibly have been talking about unemployment insurance, because you have to have worked to even receive it. So he obviously doesn't know what unemployment insurance is.

And to my colleague, I say that the American people know that they should be blessed with work, but they need meaningful work with a living wage.

I will continue to be a voice for the poor and will always fight on behalf of the 46 million Americans trying to survive in households with inadequate incomes. Americans need us to open the gates of opportunity so they can eat properly, get a quality education, and find good-paying jobs.

So on this 50th anniversary, I am making it clear that the war on poverty might be over, but the fight for the poor is not. We must reinforce the plans of President Johnson that would ensure all Americans can support themselves and their families and have better chances to contribute to our economy and our society. This is the way we build upon the progress we have made over the past five decades, not by taking action to reverse it.

To paraphrase Dr. King, he says, we have an obligation to those who have been left out of the sunlight of opportunity.

FOOTBALL SUCCESS IN NORTH CAROLINA'S TENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, last month was a big one for North Carolina football. You probably are well aware of the exploits of Cam Newton and the Carolina Panthers having clinched a playoff berth, but it was actually in my district, the Tenth District of North Carolina, in western North Carolina that was really the epicenter of football in North Carolina in the month of December.

First, there was Crest High School in Cleveland County representing the Boiling Springs and Shelby area. Crest is a perennial powerhouse in North Carolina high school football. This year's Charger team was under the guidance of Coach Mark Barnes. They rode a 14-game winning streak on their way to winning the North Carolina High School Athletic Association 3AA West title. While they were upset in the State championship game, it was another very impressive season for Coach Barnes and his great team.

While the Crest defeat was disappointing, all was not lost for Cleveland County, as another traditional power, Shelby High School, also played for a State championship. The Golden Lions went 12-4 this year, and capped the season with a 29-7 victory to win the North Carolina 2A State football championship. Coach Lance Ware and his team continued the proud tradition at Shelby as this marked the school's 12th State championship—pretty incredible, considering my high school has had a hard time just getting one or two.

Finally, the football success in North Carolina 10 continued in Catawba County, where Lenoir-Rhyne University, their football team enjoyed their best season in school history. The Bears, coached by Mike Houston, won a school record 13 games on their way to earning a spot in the NCAA Division II championship game in Florence, Alabama. While they lost the championship game, this year's Bears team finished the season ranked second in the Nation and provided a thrilling ride for the Lenoir-Rhyne campus and Hickory, as a whole. Both the faculty and alumni were very excited, and they had a great rally before that game. And it actually brought Lenoir-Rhyne onto the national stage for some attention as well. It is a great university.

So I want to congratulate Crest, Shelby, and Lenoir-Rhyne on their great successes this last football season. Now it is up to Cam and Luke to keep it going for North Carolina football. And, hopefully, the Panthers will win.

Go Panthers.

□ 1045

URGING THE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP TO PASS UNEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE FOR THE LONG-TERM UNEMPLOYED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBSTER). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as our Nation marks the 50th anniversary of the war on poverty this week, I rise to urge the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives to immediately extend unemployment assistance to the long-term unemployed workers who continue to struggle to find jobs as our economy recovers from one of the worst economic crises in its history.

The declaration of the war on poverty was a historic moment in our Nation's history when we affirmed our national priority to support those in need. The war on poverty helped reaffirm that our government has a responsibility to protect our citizens, especially during times of economic hardship. Providing support and economic opportunity creates a stronger citizenry and a stronger country.

In contrast, the expiration of the emergency unemployment program last month undermines the economic security of our citizens and of our Nation. The expiration of the emergency unemployment program cut off more than 1.3 million Americans from unemployment insurance, with approximately 72,000 additional Americans losing benefits each week during the first half of 2014.

In my home State of Illinois, where the unemployment rate remains high, at 9.2 percent, an estimated 82,000 Illinoisans lost benefits on December 28, with 38,000 of those citizens living in Cook County alone. An additional 89,100, or roughly 3,000 Illinoisans a week, will exhaust regular benefits without access to emergency benefits in just the first half of 2014.

Failing to help these citizens is an unacceptable failure of leadership. Failure to continue emergency unemployment benefits is not a theoretical issue for millions of Americans. It is a daily nightmare.

These Americans lost their jobs through no fault of their own. They tirelessly try to find work when the jobs are few and far between. They struggle to cover basic food, housing, and transportation costs for their families on an average of \$290 a week, a pitance which typically replaces only half of the average family's expenditures. Failing to help these citizens is an unacceptable failure.

Failure to continue emergency unemployment benefits poses a realistic threat to our fragile economic recovery, costing over 200,000 much-needed jobs and restricting our economic growth. The expiration drained over \$400 million from State economies. In Illinois alone, the loss of an average

\$313 in the weekly benefit means a negative impact of \$25 million for our citizens.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt said, "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have little." Congress must act quickly to support our citizens and our economic recovery by continuing emergency unemployment benefits. The time to do it is now.

HONORING THE LIFE OF REPRESENTATIVE ANDY JACOBS OF INDIANA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to rise to honor the life of a great Hoosier, one of Indiana's finest public servants, Representative Andy Jacobs. I didn't know Andy as well as some of my other Hoosier colleagues, but I met him several times during his three decades representing Indiana in Congress, and I certainly knew Andy by his stellar reputation.

What impressed me most about him on those occasions that we met was the humbleness with which he approached his job and the respect and civility he showed for his constituents and his colleagues, regardless of their party affiliation or political ideology. Andy never took himself too seriously. He drove a beat-up Oldsmobile and dressed like an average guy, which he was.

This humble and decent man was a fierce advocate for civil rights and senior citizens and built a remarkable record of public service on behalf of his constituents. That is why he was held in such unusually high regard by Republicans and Democrats alike.

Andy exemplified all that was right about being a public servant. He could disagree without being disagreeable. He believed you could lift people up without tearing people down. Despite his many years representing his constituents in Congress, he refused to become jaded and allow what is wrong with politics to stop him from doing what is right.

Representative Andy Jacobs never forgot where he came from and personified what being a Hoosier is all about. He was a good man and led a great life that left a remarkable legacy.

I want to extend the thoughts and prayers of the people of Indiana's Sixth Congressional District to Andy's wife, children, and to all those who knew and loved him. May God comfort and watch over them and continue to bless the country that Andy so loved.

BIPARTISANSHIP EVERY DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I salute my colleague for those eloquent remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the famed English poet Alfred Tennyson once wrote, "Hope smiles from the threshold of the year to come." Indeed, let's hope that this is the spirit that greets us here in the start of the second session of the 113th Congress. Having ended last year on a high note with the passage of the bipartisan budget agreement, we should resolve to keep that momentum going in this new year.

Our first order of business should be delivering on the bipartisan accord reached before the holidays. Thanks to that agreement, we, for the first time, will replace a portion of the indiscriminate cuts of sequestration with a more balanced approach. That is particularly important in communities like my own in northern Virginia which were disproportionately affected because of their strong ties to the Federal Government.

Next week's anticipated appropriations package will increase Federal investments in research, innovation, and transportation. That, in turn, will help unleash business investments and create jobs, which have lagged due to the sense of uncertainty fueled by the political brinkmanship here in Congress. Until those dollars produce results, we need to work together to extend the current safety net, specifically, unemployment insurance and nutrition assistance, to make sure we are not leaving our friends and neighbors behind.

We have made significant strides pushing down the unemployment rate to 7 percent, its lowest point in 5 years. We have added more than 8 million jobs in the past 4 years nationwide. That is still 1.3 million short of the number that were there before the Great Recession.

Equally important, 40 percent of the unemployed are long-term unemployed, 2 years or more. This structural unemployment has been devastating for those individuals and their families in their respective communities. That is why extending emergency unemployment benefits is so critically important. This is a lifeline that families rely on to keep food on the table.

More than 1.3 million Americans, including 9,000 in my own home State of Virginia and another 39,000 in the Speaker's State of Ohio, have already lost benefits because of Congress' inaction. Thousands more will see their benefits cut in the coming months. I remind my friends on the Republican side of the aisle that both unemployment insurance and nutrition assistance provide an immediate and tangible boost to our local economies. Pulling that assistance back now would be devastating in its effects and would undercut the economic momentum we have worked so hard to build these past few months.

Every dollar in assistance provided to the unemployed generates \$1.64 in the local economy, and similarly, every dollar provided under the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program

has a multiplier effect of \$1.79. These programs have helped keep generations of families out of poverty even while income inequality is growing worse.

A recent report shows that nearly half of the Nation's schoolchildren now qualify for free and reduced lunches. Those children, who come from low-income homes, account for more than half of all of the students in 17 States, mostly in Republican districts in the South and the West, I might add. A decade ago, just four States reported a majority of their schoolchildren eligible for free and reduced school lunches.

While I and many of my colleagues remain hopeful that the House will extend these vital supports, we are disheartened to see that the very first legislative action scheduled by the House majority in this new year is a return to the cynical attack on the Affordable Care Act. Ironically, just this week, the actuaries for Medicare and Medicaid released a report showing that in the 4 years since the adoption of the Affordable Care Act, for the first time ever, national health care expenditures have grown at the slowest rate since the government began collecting that data 50 years ago. The growth for insurance premiums in particular has slowed more than 60 percent, which equates to real savings for real workers, real families, and for our government.

I want to work with my Republican colleagues to ensure proper oversight and accountability for the Affordable Care Act, but let's hang up this tired routine of trying to chip away or outright repeal these essential benefits and protections for families.

One of our Republican colleagues was quoted in the paper this week as saying, "A lot of Republicans think the big, bipartisan deal was the budget agreement" last year. Working together in a bipartisan fashion is not a limited exercise. It is what our citizens expect of us each and every day.

IT IS TIME TO RAISE THE WAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker and friends, it is no coincidence that President Johnson declared a war on poverty within 6 months after Dr. King gave his "I Have a Dream" speech on the Mall in Washington. Whether by accident or whether by design, Dr. King and President Johnson worked in tandem with each other. They had something in common: they were both intelligent in their own right.

But intelligence without courage can be intelligence wasted. They both understood the politics of their time, but understanding the politics of your time without courage can be an understanding wasted. It was courage that made the difference in the lives of people for decades after they each did what they had to do. I thank God that Dr. King and President Johnson acted

in tandem and that they both had courage.

The marchers on Washington had 10 demands. Number 8 on that list of 10 demands was a demand to raise the wage to an amount that people could make a living off of, \$2 an hour. That \$2 an hour, adjusted for inflation today, would be \$13.39, more than \$13 an hour. Mr. Speaker and friends, it is time to raise the wage.

A UC Berkeley Labor Center report in 2013 connoted, denoted, and showed that families working in the fast food industry are subsidized to the tune of about \$7 billion. It is time to raise the wage. That same report showed that 63 percent of all families receiving subsidies had a working member. It is time to raise the wage.

Corporate welfare, corporations paying poverty wages, are indirectly subsidized with tax dollars when tax dollars provide food stamps, SNAP, Medicaid, and other assistance to workers. Indirect corporate subsidies will diminish and tax dollars will be saved when we raise the wage.

Do you like trickle-down economics? If so, you ought to want to raise the wage because by raising the wage, we can assure that the earned trickle will get down to the worker that has earned it. It is time to raise the wage.

Do you think people should pull themselves up by their bootstraps? Then raise the wage, and people will be able to pull themselves up out of poverty with their economic bootstraps.

Can we afford to raise the wage? Mr. Speaker and friends, yes, we can. On February 13, 2013, The Washington Post reported that the United States has one of the lowest minimum wages among developed countries, even though we are among the richest countries in the world. One out of every 60 persons is a millionaire. One out of every 11 households is worth \$1 million. According to the AFL-CIO, CEO pay has gone from \$42 for every \$1 a worker made in 1982 to \$354 for every dollar a worker made in 2012. It is time to raise the wage.

□ 1100

According to Forbes, the top 25 CEOs of hedge funds—the top 25 earners at hedge funds—earn more than all 500 of the top CEOs in the Fortune 500 combined. It is time to raise the wage.

In 2007, one CEO made \$3 billion; \$3 billion is \$400 a second. It would take a minimum-wage worker working full-time 198,000 years. Some things bear repeating: it would take a minimum-wage worker 198,000 years to make what that CEO made in 1 year. It is time to raise the wage.

If we can pay CEOs \$400 a second, we can raise the wage. If we can pay corporate CEOs 354 times what workers are making, we can raise the wage to \$13 an hour.

HONORING ANDREW JACOBS, JR.,
UNITED STATES MARINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, a fellow Hoosier, fellow marine and fellow patriot died on December 28 in his 81st year. I didn't know Andrew Jacobs, Jr., a gentleman who for 30 years represented the Indianapolis area in the House of Representatives with great distinction. But I am familiar with the qualities of a decent, honorable public servant; and Andy Jacobs deserves to be remembered, honored, and even emulated by those of us who now serve in this body or bother to keep watch on its proceedings.

He was born February 24, 1932, in Indianapolis. After high school, Jacobs joined the United States Marine Corps. He was a plucky marine. His country called him to serve in the Korean war. He responded to the call of duty, fought bravely, and was wounded in action.

When Jacobs returned home to Indiana, he enrolled in Indiana University, graduating in 1955, and 3 years later he graduated from IU's law school.

Jacobs had a passion for public service. So after completing his studies in 1958, the marine kept fighting—fighting for a better America first as a sheriff's deputy, then as a lawyer, then as a State legislator, and then, beginning in 1965, as a Member of Congress.

In Congress, Andy Jacobs was a member of the House Ways and Means Committee where he fought to balance the Federal budget and simplify the Tax Code. He also fought, in the memorable words of journalist Colman McCarthy, to "oppose wars that he believed couldn't be won, explained or afforded."

Jacobs is survived by countless admirers, a beloved wife of 25 years, two sons and two sisters. May each of us honor this fallen marine's memory—and his constancy of purpose—by picking up his rifle and doing our part to fight for a better America.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WAR ON POVERTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to continue with our 50 floor speeches marking the 50th anniversary of the war on poverty.

Now, yesterday, we were joined by President Lyndon Baines Johnson and Lady Bird Johnson's eldest daughter, Lynda Johnson Robb, to mark the 50th anniversary of her father's State of the Union speech in which he declared an unconditional war on poverty. She reminded us that this was a bipartisan and bicameral effort led by the White House.

Now, I have shared my own story, reluctantly, in the past of the time in my

life when I depended on our vital social safety net programs during some very difficult times; but my testimony is only one of millions of other Americans. Many of you may be familiar with the Campaign to Cut Poverty in Half in Ten Years, a project of the Center for American Progress, the Coalition on Human Needs, and the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights. Now, they are doing phenomenal work gathering American stories of those who are living in poverty and have been lifted out of poverty, including our own Congressman POCAN's constituent, Amy Treptow's story.

Amy is here today, and I look forward to hearing Congressman POCAN read her story later on this House floor. Her story, though, is a true representation of the legacy of the war on poverty and the promise of the American Dream fulfilled. Her story is not unlike one of my constituents in Oakland who visited my office here in D.C. last month. After becoming a single mother, Jennifer was forced to stop attending her college courses and take a job making minimum wage as a caregiver. She relied on CalWIC and food stamps to feed her daughters, and her family and friends supported her with her housing and other basic needs.

Today, two of her daughters are graduates of the Head Start program, which prepared them to start elementary school where they are currently doing very well. And Jennifer was able to finish school and is now working to advocate on behalf of other families like hers who had to turn to the American people in her time of need. Also, I am reminded that one of my former district directors was a graduate of the Head Start program. He is doing phenomenal work raising a family and living the American Dream.

These are stories of resilience. They are the stories of millions of Americans who are facing homelessness, hunger and unemployment, if it weren't for a safety net. In my home State of California, 6.3 million people—17 percent—lived in poverty in 2012. And in my district in Oakland, California, 18 percent of the residents live below the Federal poverty level, including one in four children.

While the richest segments of our population continue to prosper nationally, income inequality traps millions of the working poor in poverty. Many low-wage workers must rely on food stamps and Medicaid just to survive—which our colleague Congressman AL GREEN just brilliantly laid out—just to survive while CEOs are making megabillions with government subsidies.

As a recent study by the National Poverty Center at the University of Michigan showed, in any given month, 1.7 million households live on a cash income of less than \$2 per day. Now that is comparable to many living in the developing world. Yes, \$2. I said \$2 per day. Now, that is here in America, the richest Nation on this Earth.

In an economy that, despite recent gains, there are three unemployed for every one job opening, it is really a shame and a disgrace that 1.3 million people lost their lifeline as Republicans continue to refuse to extend emergency unemployment compensation. Now, these individuals' checks should arrive or should have arrived this week. Unfortunately, they did not. What in the world are people going to do now? This is heartless, it is mean-spirited, and, of course, to add insult to injury, many of these people lost about \$35 in food stamp benefits last November.

Yes, the economy has gotten better for some, but has left millions behind. Fifty years ago, the safety net was put in place just for times such as these. That is why it is so important to share stories like Jennifer's and like Amy's. Vital social safety net programs are still needed. We need to stop this war on the poor. We should have a ceasefire on the war on the poor. We have a moral and we have an economic obligation to make investments in economic opportunity and jobs.

NAFTA AT 20

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, last week marked the 20th anniversary of NAFTA's going into effect. The North American Free Trade Agreement was a hard-fought fight here in this Congress with a very close vote. In 1994, when it narrowly passed under a rule not allowing amendment, called Fast Track, America was promised that NAFTA would be a great jobs boon for our country and our economy. Exactly the reverse has happened.

The NAFTA promises made have all been broken. First, on jobs: the administration at the time promised that NAFTA would initially create 200,000 new jobs. In reality, America has now lost, after 20 years, about 1 million jobs related to NAFTA's impact, and the old sucking sound actually happened. Our jobs were off-shored, sucked away. More than 680,000 American jobs have gone to Mexico alone. Yes, that great sucking sound continues to happen.

About 60 percent of the jobs lost, of the million jobs lost overall, were lost to Mexico in the manufacturing sector. These were middle class jobs that came from places like Cleveland, Toledo, Pittsburgh, Chicago and Buffalo, and the list goes on. They were good paying jobs in our country that had provided living wages, medical benefits, and employer contributions to retirement programs.

America was also promised that NAFTA would fuel dynamic trade in tearing down trade barriers and creating trade surpluses for our country which means that we actually would export more than we imported with jobs created as a result. Well, guess what, the trade barriers that NAFTA was supposed to tear down have actu-

ally created massive trade deficits—red ink—for our country.

If one looks back at the passage of NAFTA, prior to its passage, America actually had a trade surplus with Mexico. That is more U.S. exports out than Mexico imports in. But then with NAFTA's passage, we began to start really going deep into the hole of jobs being off-shored. And then with other trade agreements like free trade with communist China—which isn't free by any measure—we see that America's trade deficits have accumulated annually to historic levels never experienced by this society before.

The cost of this has been huge. Since NAFTA took effect, the annual U.S. trade deficit has increased by 5 times, a 500 percent increase from \$98 billion in the red to \$534 billion in the red. Each billion dollars of trade deficit accounts for anywhere between 5,000 and 10,000 lost jobs depending if it is in the retail sector or the industrial sector. Our cumulative trade deficit over the 20 years due to NAFTA—get ready for this—is \$1.5 trillion. If you want to understand why America has a job deficit and a budget deficit at the Federal level, it is because we have off-shored so many jobs through these trade agreements that are passed under the Fast Track procedure.

The year before NAFTA took effect, America actually had a \$1.6 trillion trade surplus with Mexico; but every year after NAFTA took effect in 1995, that trade surplus with Mexico was turned into a \$15.8 billion trade deficit in the first year. And every single year, it has simply gotten worse. By 2012, our trade deficit with Mexico ballooned to \$61.6 billion. So every year, the hole got deeper. What a failure NAFTA is on the jobs front and on the trade front.

Finally, supporters of NAFTA claimed that NAFTA would open markets for American exports to Mexico. I will tell you one thing Ohio saw. Ohio saw pork production that used to happen in Ohio platformed down near Mexico City where environmental regulations, if they exist at all, are certainly not enforced. And we look at companies like Mr. Coffee that were sucked out of Cleveland and moved to Mexico. We saw suppliers in the automotive industry being relocated from our country to Mexico and Canada with U.S. middle class jobs just vaporized one factory, one farm at a time. It is as though the lights are being shut out from coast to coast in neighborhood after neighborhood.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation that I have introduced, H.R. 191, the NAFTA Accountability Act, basically says that these trade agreements have to work in America's interest, starting with NAFTA; and where these agreements have failed, adjustments must occur in order to stem the off-shoring of any jobs so we can begin re-creating middle class jobs in this country again. The NAFTA trade model must be replaced, fast track must be sidetracked, and jobs in America must be created again to rebuild our middle class.

□ 1115

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF WAR ON POVERTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago this week, in this very Chamber, President Lyndon Johnson declared an “unconditional war on poverty.” The mission the President outlined was grand, but his goal for each and every American was modest:

Help them fulfill their basic hopes—their hopes for a fair chance to make good; their hopes for fair play under the law; their hopes for a full-time job on full-time pay; their hopes for a decent home for their family in a decent community; their hopes for a good school for their children with good teachers; and their hopes for security when faced with sickness or unemployment or old age.

Fifty years later, the results speak for themselves:

The number of children living in poverty has dropped by 10 percent; the number of seniors living in poverty has plummeted by 32 percent; tens of millions of Americans have health insurance because of Medicare and Medicaid; the percentage of adults completing high school has skyrocketed from 56 percent to 88 percent; the share of women in the workforce has increased from 42 percent to 64 percent; and each and every single day, millions of school children go to school with full stomachs because of nutrition assistance.

We have much as a Nation we can be proud of; and the best way, the very best way we can celebrate and honor that progress is to rededicate ourselves to the challenges remaining. Because the truth of the matter is there are still too many Americans out of work, and there are still too many Americans working in jobs that don't pay enough to raise a family, and there are still too many Americans working harder for less.

I don't pretend that there are easy solutions to these problems. There is no cure-all, there is no silver bullet Congress can fire, but we simply cannot stand down; and we cannot, as President Johnson warned, “fritter and fumble away our opportunity in needless, senseless quarrels between Democrats and Republicans.”

Sound familiar?

So, Mr. Speaker, on this 50th anniversary of the start of the war on poverty, it comes down to one simple question we should have the courage to ask ourselves: Are we doing everything we reasonably can to strengthen the middle class and help those working to get into it? Let me repeat that. Are we doing everything we reasonably can to strengthen the middle class and help those working to get into it? And I think we should also have the courage to answer that question honestly, and I think we all know the answer. It is “no.” But we also all know that we can. That is the question of our time.

The question of the day is whether or not we are going to help in this way by

extending unemployment compensation benefits. The business case for this is exceedingly strong. The fact of the matter is that there are three people looking for work for every job available. The fact of the matter is that long-term unemployment is nearly twice as high as it was at each of the times that we ended emergency unemployment compensation over the last couple of decades. The business case for this is very strong, for those 1.3 million people already affected and the 2.6 million or so or more that will be affected in this calendar year. The business case is very strong.

There are those, of course, who will suggest that there are those who abuse unemployment compensation. I am not going to quibble about that, but I am going to reject the principle that Americans don't want to work, don't need to work, and that we are not hardwired to work, and I can prove it to you. I can absolutely prove it to you. Stop right now and ask yourself, what is the first thing you ask someone when you meet them?

“What do you do?”

We define ourselves by our work. It gives us pride. It helps us support our family. It makes our communities and neighborhoods stronger. Americans want to work. And when they cannot, we ought to be there to help them. We can, and we should.

MARKING 50 YEARS OF THE WAR ON POVERTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) for 3½ minutes.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago, President Johnson declared in this Chamber the war on poverty, and this is one war that we must continue to wage.

I want to thank my neighbor in Alameda County who represents Oakland and San Leandro and Alameda and Berkeley, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, who is Congress' greatest champion today to continue fighting President Johnson's war on poverty, and I am grateful to have a mentor in Congresswoman LEE who has guided and helped me as I have worked to do my part.

Since President Johnson's declaration, we have made real progress. Using an accurate measurement of who is poor in America shows we have cut the rate from 25.8 percent in 1967 to 16 percent in 2012, reducing by millions the number of Americans who are poor. Unfortunately, this war is not yet won. Almost 50 million Americans still live in poverty, including over 13 million children. In such an abundant society as ours, there is only one word to describe these stark facts, “unconscionable,” and we can do better.

This Congress should make it a priority to help the poor, the economically downtrodden, and the jobless. Their path to economic opportunity

still remains dim. But this Congress, the people in this House, can be their light. If we are going to win the war on poverty, there are many battles today that we must win:

First, we should start by extending unemployment insurance now and not putting 1.3 million Americans out in the cold;

Second, we need to raise our minimum wage so those working hard and trying to earn a living can actually do so;

Third, we must fight harsh cuts to SNAP and Head Start to make sure everyone has equal opportunity.

These are just a few of the small battles that we must win right now in the larger war on poverty.

This is no time to turn back or to retreat. This is a time for a surge in our war against poverty. Millions of Americans, including children, are counting on us, and we must ask ourselves a few questions:

Has this war been won?

Has poverty been eradicated across America?

And is our middle class built out?

If the answer to any of these questions is “no,” then we know what we must continue to do. We must fight on, and we must keep fighting until we win the war on poverty.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 22 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Loving God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

At the beginning of this new day, we are grateful as individuals and as a Nation for the blessings we have been given.

We ask Your blessing upon the Members of this people's House. May they anticipate the opportunities and difficulties that are before them, and before so many Americans, with steadfast determination to work together toward solutions that will benefit their countrymen.

Grant that they be worthy of the responsibilities they have been given by their constituents and truly the people You have called them to be.

May the walls of disagreement that have divided this assembly be put aside and replaced with a spirit of respect

and dignity. And may Your spirit, O God, be in all of our hearts and minds and encourage us to do the works of peace and justice, now and always.

May all that we do be done for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. FORBES led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

MILITARY COMMISSARIES

(Mr. FORBES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to media reports that have suggested the closure of military commissaries in the United States and that that may be under consideration by the Department of Defense.

Our national defense, and the men and women who volunteer to serve, are not the cause of our current financial fiscal crisis. Proposals that ask them to carry the weight of solving it are unacceptable.

Commissaries are a vital recruitment and retention tool essential to maintaining the all-volunteer force. President Obama recognized this fact earlier this year when he visited Camp Pendleton during a furlough day and said commissary closures are "not how a great Nation should be treating its military and military families."

Each year, commissaries provide an average 31 percent savings for military families. Additionally, by allowing the Defense Commissary Agency, based out of Fort Lee, Virginia, to purchase products at higher volumes, the 178 commissaries in the United States bring down costs across all our commissaries.

I urge my colleagues to oppose any effort to close our commissaries, a system that is highly valued by our servicemembers and part of the commitment we make to take care of them during and after their time volunteering in service to our Nation.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

(Mr. COSTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, as a representative of the San Joaquin Valley of California, I know our economic recovery has been uneven at best. Unemployment remains unacceptably high in areas like my district.

Those on unemployment are not socking taxpayer dollars away for a rainy day. Today already is their rainy day. Their benefits go back into our economy immediately for basic needs, like food and rent, while they look for work.

After 27 years at an insurance company, Jacqueline of Atwater, California, was let go last May. Since then the 53-year-old has struggled to find work.

Another constituent of mine, Luis in Fresno, lost his unemployment insurance at the end of December. This father wrote:

If I don't find a job in the next couple of weeks, then I will not be able to pay my rent or pay for food for my family.

With all the talk about restoring certainty to our economy, we cannot forget that American families drive this economy.

Now is not the time to take money out of their pockets as they are also struggling to recover. Let's restore unemployment with a bipartisan effort.

TODAY'S ECONOMY

(Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, while home for Christmas, I reflected on the economic challenges America faces and the parallels today's economy has with the one Ronald Reagan inherited from Jimmy Carter in 1981. Both were characterized by high unemployment and low labor-force participation.

I will paraphrase some of what President Reagan said in first Inaugural address:

Idle industries have cast workers into unemployment, causing human misery and personal indignity. Those who do work are denied a fair return for their labor by a tax system which penalizes successful achievement and keeps us from maintaining full productivity.

For decades, we have piled deficit upon deficit, mortgaging our future and our children's future for the temporary convenience of present.

By the end of Ronald Reagan's Presidency, America's unemployment rate was 5.4 percent and our economy was the envy of the world. It is time we learn from history. As President Reagan said, Government is the problem. Individuals, free from the heavy hand of Big Government to pursue their dreams, they create prosperity. It is time we revisit the simple, sacred truth.

EXTEND UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

(Ms. CHU asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, this past Monday was the first time in months that 1.3 million out-of-work Americans went to their mailboxes and did not find an unemployment check.

People like Kaitlyn Smith from my State of California, a Marine Corps vet and mother of two young children, she said that she had been searching for work for months but has not had success. California is starting to recover, but it still has 400,000 fewer jobs than it did before the downturn. It is especially hard to find jobs in the high desert where she lives; but the family can't move because her husband, a veteran of the Afghanistan and Iraq wars, must remain near the combat center until he is discharged from the Marines in July.

The loss of her benefits will cut even more deeply into the couple's income. Kaitlyn says the family is already skimping on basics, including heat. She says:

I have to keep the house at 55 degrees, even though I have two little girls, ages 2½ and 1½.

For Kaitlyn and others like her, we must extend unemployment benefits, and we must extend them now.

VISIT TO CHARLIE NORWOOD VAMC

(Mr. BROUN of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this week I went to Augusta, Georgia, to participate in an oversight hearing with Chairman JEFF MILLER of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. This visit was the result of multiple deaths and delays in care reported in the Augusta veterans hospital. We must find out what exactly went wrong.

As both a U.S. Marine and a current medical doctor in the Navy Reserves, I take reports of poor care for our veterans very seriously. I questioned hospital staff on how, when, and why these lapses in care occurred, and who is ultimately responsible.

While it appears that under new leadership the hospital is heading in a positive direction, this is just the beginning of a full investigation. We have made promises to our veterans. It is vital that we fulfill these promises.

I have pledged to work to hold those responsible and the VA accountable. I am fully committed to making sure that our veterans receive world-class health care in Augusta, as well as VA hospitals all across the country.

FULL FUNDING FOR CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, the Peace Bridge, located along the northern border of my western New York district, facilitates the transport of over \$30 billion in commerce annually. However, increasing wait times and delays pose a significant threat to our Nation's economy.

While I am encouraged by the start of the preinspection pilot at the Peace Bridge for commercial vehicles, which would allow trucks entering the United States to be prescreened on the Canadian side of the border, I am concerned about staffing levels with Customs agents at the border.

I have called on Customs and Border Protection to increase staffing levels at the bridge to facilitate easier accessibility at northern border crossings and also encouraged the FY 2014 Homeland Security appropriations budget to include full funding for Customs and Border Protection officer staffing requests.

The streamlined flow of people and goods across the border is critical to the western New York economy and to the Nation's economy. I am committed to fighting to preserve and improve our relationship with Canada and our economic relationship.

OBAMACARE SECURITY

(Mr. HOLDING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate enough that ObamaCare has increased the cost of health care for families across the country. On top of the skyrocketing premiums, limited choices for doctors and coverage, and regulatory burdens on small business, it is worrisome that people's personal information is now being subjected to potential fraud in the ObamaCare exchanges.

The security problems with healthcare.gov go far beyond error messages and connection issues. In many cases, the people in charge of collecting and processing our most sensitive information haven't been fully trained or vetted; and although the administration knew the Web site hadn't been properly tested, they launched it anyway, leaving the American people vulnerable.

That is why I introduced H.R. 3652, the No Identity Theft in Health Care Act, which would increase penalties for those who abuse their access to personal information that Americans are forced to submit when signing up for ObamaCare to commit identity theft. I also look forward to supporting the Health Exchange Security and Transparency Act later this week.

Mr. Speaker, it is unacceptable that people's personal information is at

risk. The administration needs to address this.

REPEAL OF CUT TO COLA FOR MILITARY RETIREES UNDER 62

(Ms. BROWNLEY of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, on December 23, I introduced H.R. 3804, legislation to repeal an ill-conceived provision of the budget bill that reduced the cost-of-living adjustment for military retirees.

As a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I believe our servicemembers, veterans, and their families must receive the benefits they have so honorably earned and deserve. These benefits are owed to them without equivocation.

We should not balance the budget on the backs of military retirees who served our country so bravely for decades. They should not be punished because of Congress' failure to get our fiscal house in order. That is why I urge Speaker BOEHNER to allow a vote today on my bill, H.R. 3804, and repeal this egregious provision.

Clearly, there is substantial bipartisan support to correct this. Let's vote on H.R. 3804 for our military retirees today.

OBAMACARE'S SECURITY RISKS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last October, a constituent living in Columbia received a frightening phone call from a gentleman in North Carolina. It appeared the constituent's security information was obtained by a stranger while enrolling for health insurance under the government health care Web site.

The American people should not have to worry about personal information being compromised due to the government's inability to keep a Web site secure. Had the gentleman from North Carolina not contacted this South Carolinian, he may have never realized his information was being breached.

ObamaCare is flawed and must be repealed. Because the President and Senate refuse to join us in these efforts, the House continues to act. Tomorrow, the House will vote on a bill that requires Health and Human Services to notify individuals when their personal information is stolen or unlawfully accessed.

We must continue to work to repeal ObamaCare by replacing it with a plan to preserve the doctor-patient relationship, as long proposed by Congressman TOM PRICE.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

□ 1215

CLIMATE CHANGE DENIERS

(Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues to recognize the devastating consequences of air pollution, which is causing, or at least contributing to greatly, the drastic changes in the Earth's climate.

Last year we experienced severe record-setting weather across the country, yet Republicans and climate deniers argue that no single weather event can be proven to have been caused by climate change. Paradoxically, climate deniers are now using the extreme cold snap as evidence to support their cause, which is to do away with all laws and regulations that protect our precious air quality.

The maddening denial of the link between air quality and climate change is reckless, and it is a denial of scientific fact. Our posterity deserves more. We know, and 95 percent of scientists agree, that climate change leads to more severe weather overall, and the evidence is overwhelming.

Now is the time for a real debate on climate change before another devastating year of extreme weather that takes lives, destroys communities, and wreaks havoc on our society and our economy.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING

(Mr. LANKFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of January 2014 being National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month.

Human trafficking victims suffer repeatedly with no apparent way out. An estimated between 100,000 and 300,000 children each year become victims in America of this abhorrent practice.

Many runaway children become victims of human trafficking within 48 hours of leaving home, and it is crucial that we, as Americans, are aware of our surroundings and immediately contact authorities when we see anything suspicious around children. Traffickers can be found at airports, parking lots, schools, malls, and other places where they search for young victims.

Two years ago, I authored a bill which this House passed, the Senate passed, and the President signed at the end of 2012 eliminating trafficking on our military bases around the world and our State Department facilities around the world.

We, as Americans, believe every person has value. Every person has rights that are given to them by their creator. Mr. Speaker, I would encourage every American, if they come into contact with someone that they suspect is a victim of human trafficking, to contact the National Human Trafficking

Hotline at 888-373-7888. Let's help our fellow Americans.

War Eagle.

CLIMATE CHANGE

(Mr. MORAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, most Americans this week felt as though they were living on the North Pole. There was a condition called "the polar vortex" that became part of our common vernacular. Normal routines were disrupted. Schools closed, water mains ruptured, car batteries failed, and, tragically, weather-related deaths went up. So it didn't take long for conservative commentators to offer this cold weather phenomenon as proof that the planet isn't warming, that this is all a hoax or some left-wing liberal ideology.

But the fact is that scientists have told us that the real and measurable decline of Arctic sea ice that is the direct result of warmer weather and climate change is creating this polar vortex that allows weather conditions that normally remain fixed over the Arctic to spin out of control. They slip south and they subject us to Arctic-like weather conditions.

Now, this is a fact that we need to recognize and do something about or weather conditions are going to become far more common and far more severe.

ONE OF THE BEST BCS CHAMPIONSHIP GAMES EVER

(Mr. ROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, this past week, the college football season culminated in one of the best BCS Championship games ever played when the Auburn Tigers took on the FSU Seminoles.

Even though I am a resident of Florida, I am a graduate of Auburn and was, of course, rooting for my Tigers.

I want to commend Auburn's coach, Gus Malzahn, for taking Auburn from worst to first in the SEC and leading his team to play for the national championship game. His efforts were nothing short of incredible. He made believers not only of his players, but also believers out of all of us. He showed us that persistence, discipline, self-confidence, and faith in God will lead to success, both individually and as a team.

I also want to congratulate my friend, Coach Jimbo Fisher of Florida State. Coach Fisher is not only a great coach, but he obviously married well because his wife, Candi, is also an Auburn alumnus.

While my heart is always in Auburn, my hat goes off to the Florida State Seminoles for a well-earned victory. Congratulations.

THE WAR ON POVERTY

(Ms. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate a milestone in our Nation's history. Fifty years ago, President Lyndon B. Johnson stood before Congress and declared an unconditional war on poverty.

As we reflect on this war, I am inspired by the progress we have made in 50 years. We have expanded economic opportunity, and we have made the American Dream a reality for millions. But this is not enough. Recent events, like allowing unemployment insurance to expire, remind us that the war is not over.

Even though our economy is recovering from a recession, 10.9 million Americans are still struggling to find work. Meanwhile, 16 million children live in poverty. And now the 1.3 million Americans who lost unemployment insurance have no means to provide for their family while they look for work.

This cannot continue. No child should go to bed hungry, and no family should struggle to keep a roof over their heads.

Fifty years ago we started a war, and yes, we have won many battles. But it is time to win the war, and we must start by making sure that Americans can continue to meet basic needs as they pursue their dreams. So I urge my colleagues to stand with me and extend unemployment insurance.

THE PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT

(Mr. REED asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise to highlight yet another of the unintended consequences of the Democratic health care law.

Because of the employer mandate in ObamaCare, our volunteer fire departments and emergency response organizations are at risk of having their volunteers be considered employees and are, therefore, being forced to choose between retaining those volunteers and using their precious resources to comply with this mandate or cutting those volunteers and the vital services they provide to our communities.

As I have heard from people in my district, Cattaraugus County Office of Emergency Services, the impact would be absolutely detrimental to critical services in rural areas like Cattaraugus County.

I ask Congress to fix this unfair burden on our emergency volunteers and support H.R. 3685, the Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act, introduced by my good friend, Representative LOU BARLETTA.

CELEBRATING THE 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIKORSKY AIRCRAFT COMPANY

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention to the 90th anniversary of the Sikorsky Aircraft Company, one of the lynchpins of our State's advanced industrial base, a pillar of our national defense, and the world's premiere helicopter manufacturer.

Ninety years ago, Russian-born inventor Igor Sikorsky opened the Sikorsky Aero Engineering Corporation for business on Long Island. Since then, the history of this pioneering company has been a string of firsts.

Sikorsky built the first practical helicopter, the VS-300, in 1939. Five years later, a Sikorsky vehicle performed the first helicopter combat rescue in history, saving soldiers in Burma during World War II. In 1945, a Sikorsky helicopter took part in the first-ever civilian helicopter rescue, rescuing survivors from a sinking vessel in Long Island Sound. And in 1957, Dwight Eisenhower took the first Presidential ride in Sikorsky-made Marine One, long one of the defining symbols of the American Executive.

Today, in my State of Connecticut, Sikorsky continues to build the best helicopters in the world, including the Black Hawks so critical to our national security, and to move the technology of rotor-powered aircraft forward.

To UTC leadership and the almost 16,000 hardworking men and women of Sikorsky, congratulations on this anniversary, and here's to many more.

WE CAN'T WAIT ANY LONGER

(Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this country has 10.9 million people out of work, many of whom have been out of work for over 6 months. We can't wait any longer. Families want to work. They want a job that will allow them to put food on the table, take family vacations, and save for their children's education. And \$300 a week just won't cut it.

As we speak, the President has a permit on his desk, one that has been ready to sign for almost his entire tenure in office. The Keystone XL pipeline is a rare project supported by labor, business, and the hardworking taxpayers of this country, and one that has been studied and dissected more than most.

This project is ready to go, and, with the stroke of a pen, Mr. President, you can create 40,000 good-paying, stable jobs across this country that American families want and deserve. All they need is your signature.

Let's finally create the jobs that politicians love to talk about. Get families back to work, where they want to be, and off unemployment.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, as of the new year, 1.3 million Americans, including 17,600 Nevadans, are without a critical economic lifeline—the emergency unemployment insurance that has helped men and women stay out of poverty and keep their families afloat as they look for a job.

By allowing this program to expire, those already struggling to make ends meet are now facing even greater hardship as they are left to wonder how to put food on the table, keep a roof over their families' heads, or put gas in the car.

Denying this vital lifeline is not only morally indefensible, it is also economically shortsighted. Unemployment insurance benefits not only help the individual and their families who receive them, but they also boost our economy. Failing to renew this program will weaken economic growth and cost our country 240,000 jobs, including almost 3,000 in Nevada.

So, for the thousands of Nevadans who lost emergency unemployment insurance at the beginning of the year and the 842 more who stand to lose their benefits at the end of this week, inaction is unacceptable. I urge Speaker BOEHNER to bring this to the floor and vote in favor.

TAKE ACTION ON EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

(Mr. MAFFEI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MAFFEI. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise to urge the Republican leaders to allow a vote on extending unemployment insurance benefits to the thousands of workers in my central New York district and the 1.3 million workers across the country who have lost these benefits.

Because Congress has failed to act, hundreds of thousands of families are not having a happy new year. This important relief provides a lifeline to people who worked hard, they played by the rules, and they are out of work through no fault of their own. By providing this vital but temporary assistance to unemployed workers, this program ensures workers and their families are able to make ends meet during their job searches.

Extending unemployment insurance should not be a partisan issue. In fact, this program was signed into law by President George W. Bush and has been reauthorized several times by members of both political parties during the time of economic recovery. If there are

reforms needed to help get people back to work, then let's make those reforms, but don't toss out the whole program.

Mr. Speaker, our economy is still recovering and thousands of hardworking central New Yorkers are still struggling to find a job. Failure to extend unemployment insurance hurts the economy across central New York and across this country. The Senate has already taken bipartisan action on extending unemployment insurance. It is time for the House to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I just don't understand why we don't just have a vote. It would help the economy, and it would help our families.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE EXPIRATION

(Mr. CROWLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, for many people, a new year marks a time of hope and optimism. But millions of Americans are, instead, beginning this year with fear and worry. They are wondering how they are going to make ends meet, pay their rent, or put food on the table. That is because they woke up just a few days after Christmas to find that their emergency unemployment assistance had been terminated, cutting them off from a needed lifeline.

Now, that is just about the cruelest thing I can think of happening. It is mean. It is unnecessary. It is kicking people who are already down. It is just plain shameful. It is shameful. And it is not the kind of America I believe in.

Shouldn't we be embracing policies like unemployment insurance that keep families afloat? Shouldn't we be looking at our communities, our neighbors, and saying, yes, America will be there for you in your time of need?

Yes, we should say that.

To every one of my colleagues, I say join us in doing the right thing and restoring these needed benefits today. We need to do the right thing and not the wrong thing, and we need to do that now.

□ 1230

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 9, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on January 9, 2014 at 9:42 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 667.

That the Senate passed S. 1171.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2279, REDUCING EXCESSIVE DEADLINE OBLIGATIONS ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3362, EXCHANGE INFORMATION DISCLOSURE ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3811, HEALTH EXCHANGE SECURITY AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2014

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 455 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 455

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2279) to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act relating to review of regulations under such Act and to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 relating to financial responsibility for classes of facilities. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-30. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final

passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3362) to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to require transparency in the operation of American Health Benefit Exchanges. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3811) to require notification of individuals of breaches of personally identifiable information through Exchanges under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 455 provides for the consideration of three important bills which were reported by the Energy and Commerce Committee: H.R. 2279, the Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations Act of 2013; H.R. 3362, the Exchange Information Disclosure Act; and H.R. 3811, the Health Exchange Security and Transparency Act of 2014.

H.R. 2279 is a bill to address the burdensome and outdated deadlines for certain rulemaking activities conducted by the Environmental Protection Agency under the Solid Waste Disposal Act and the Comprehensive Envi-

ronmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act. This provides flexibility for the Environmental Protection Agency in order to streamline a process critical to cleaning up sites contaminated with certain toxic or hazardous chemicals.

It further requires the Environmental Protection Agency to evaluate existing State or other Federal financial insurance requirements to determine whether additional requirements are, in fact, necessary.

Finally, it requires the owner or operator of a chemical storage site to report the presence of such chemicals to the State emergency response commissions.

It is a commonsense piece of legislation to help clean up areas that have been polluted and allows for their reclamation or development. This could bring jobs and economic benefits to neighborhoods which have been so affected.

As the two health care-related pieces of legislation, these are targeted bills to address just a few of the massive problems the American public has witnessed over the last few months pertaining to the calamitous rollout of the Federal www.healthcare.gov Web site. The data obtained by www.healthcare.gov is one of the largest collections of personal information ever assembled. It links information between seven different Federal agencies, State agencies, and government contractors.

In promising lower costs and widespread health coverage for Americans, President Obama failed to mention that the Affordable Care Act's mandates and requirements will create large-scale disruption of the entire health insurance market. The resulting cancelation of insurance plans and high cost for employers to continue providing insurance for their workers has left millions of Americans with no choice other than to purchase health insurance through the Affordable Care Act's exchanges, subjecting their personal information to the vulnerable security infrastructure.

The initial launch of www.healthcare.gov on October 1, 2013, was plagued with glitches and errors. Not only did the administration fail to establish basic functionality of the Web site, but the initial problems really only break the surface of the deeper security threats in the underlying law. A multitude of gaps remain in the Web site's security infrastructure, making the Web site a wide-open target for hackers and identity thieves. These flaws continue to pose a threat to the security of Americans' personal data.

Mr. Speaker, it wasn't that the administration was not alerted to these security concerns on the Web site prior to the launch. MITRE Corporation, a contractor for the Department of Health and Human Services, alerted the agency that 19 unaddressed security vulnerabilities plagued the Web site prior to its launch on October 1.

Top officials at the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, including the chief information security officer, Teresa Fryer, along with the Web site's project manager, Tony Trenkle, both refused to sign the Authority to Operate license that was necessary to actually launch www.healthcare.gov. Despite these known issues, the director of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Marilyn Tavenner, continued to launch the Web site.

This is much more than a faulty Web site. This is about the American people, who cannot trust their government to certify that their personal information will be safe on a government-run Web site.

The security threat goes beyond just an individual's primary application. Once an individual's personal information is entered into the system, the exchange has the ability to access information within the Department of Homeland Security, the Internal Revenue Service, Social Security, and the Treasury Department. The administration has opened numerous Federal agencies to data breaches and unauthorized access.

Just before the holidays, the entire Nation saw firsthand what a massive security breach looks like. Over 40 million Target customers, their personal data was compromised by computer hackers who pilfered personal financial information and identification.

Target has gone out of their way to alert customers of the security breach. Unfortunately, the Federal Government has no such obligation under the law. This is a point that I don't think most people are aware of. It is not required. It is not a mandate that you have a Target charge card or that you shop at Target, but it is certainly required and a mandate that you buy your insurance through www.healthcare.gov. This is a coercive Federal policy that now is pulling people into its Web site and refuses to provide them the very same protection that we demand that the private sector do for a voluntary purchase.

Instead of following the same requirements placed on the private sector, the Federal Government has gone out of their way to avoid imposing this basic due diligence in their own exchanges. Even when a notification requirement was specifically requested during the rulemaking process on the exchanges, the administration just simply refused.

In the March 27, 2012, Federal Register, Department of Health and Human Services responded, stating:

We do not plan to include the specific notification procedures in the final rule. Consistent with this approach, we did not include specific policies for investigation of data breaches in this final rule.

Furthermore, State laws required that many of the 14 State-run insurance exchanges, that they do disclose such information. No such law exists for the federally run exchange. Mr. Speaker, I would remind you that 36

States rely upon the federally run exchange.

Look, we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars, taxpayer dollars. The American people deserve to know that their personal information is protected and to be notified if that protection lapses.

Let's be honest: www.healthcare.gov is the most talked about Web site in years. The massive amounts of personal information that is collected through www.healthcare.gov and its ability to access multiple government databases creates the perfect environment for targeting by hackers.

Over 16 attempts to hack into the system have already been reported, not to mention the many stories that have been reported in the press on the mishandling and sharing of individuals' data. Identity theft is a threat not only to an individual's credit rating and personal finances but also to overall United States security. Most Americans would be shocked to learn that this level of protection is not already in place for an initiative the size of the Affordable Care Act. Well, today the House is working to correct this injustice, protecting Americans when the administration has refused to do so.

The Obama administration has consistently refused to disclose detailed data on how many Americans have actually completed the Obama Care enrollment process. Now it is more than 3 months after the launch of the exchanges, and we just simply do not know how many Americans are enrolled in the exchange plan.

It was the administration who initially defined the success of the exchange as the number of Americans who actually enroll in the program. The number of enrollments are the only way to evaluate whether the more than \$1 trillion that was spent on this thing by the administration is actually working.

The President's commitment to an open and transparent government, repeated so many times during the passage of the Affordable Care Act, represents yet one more broken promise in a long string of broken promises.

□ 1245

Where this administration has failed, the bill before us will require the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services to provide detailed weekly reports to the American people about the enrollment number on healthcare.gov. The American people deserve to know what they are getting for their hard-earned tax dollars that they have spent on the demands of this administration.

It is the American people who are suffering because of the mismanagement and failures of this administration. Today—today—we have the opportunity to provide transparency and protect Americans' personal information.

The rule before us today provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided be-

tween the majority and the minority for each of the bills contained in the rule. The minority is further afforded the customary motion to recommit on each piece of legislation.

I want to encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying bills and stand with the millions of Americans who are asking and who are demanding that we protect their privacy.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman, Mr. BURGESS, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule today under which three bills are being brought to the floor: H.R. 3811, the Health Exchange Security and Transparency Act; H.R. 2279, the Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations Act; and H.R. 3362, the Exchange Information Disclosure Act. You wouldn't know by their names what those bills actually do. I discuss that, and, more importantly, I plan to discuss, Mr. Speaker, what these bills fail to accomplish.

These misguided and superfluous bills were brought under a very restrictive process. Two of them are being brought to the floor under a completely closed rule that blocks all efforts by Members to improve the legislation. Democrats yesterday on the Rules Committee proposed an open rule for these bills allowing Members from both sides of the aisle to offer their ideas to make them better, and it was voted down in the Rules Committee in a partisan vote.

Instead of moving forward and tackling challenges like extending unemployment, which has been talked about, or passing a jobs bill or an infrastructure bill or fixing our broken immigration system or reforming our tax system, again, we are discussing bills relating to the Affordable Care Act that don't seek to improve the act and make it work better for the American people but only add more paperwork and bureaucracy and cost to the health care system we already have by putting additional requirements on Federal workers and others that are working hard to ensure that ObamaCare works for America every day. Of the 112 legislative days we have left this year, we need to ensure that we spend them wisely, and I don't think that these three bills are a good way for us to use 2 days of our time.

The first bill, H.R. 3362, calls on HHS to publish weekly reports on consumer interactions with healthcare.gov, including the details of all calls received by the call center. Now, much of this information is already available monthly. There are already reliable updates on enrollment numbers and numerous updates on the Web sites and issues consumers have encountered. Look, while you are fixing the Web site and getting it working is not the time

to put additional requirements on those that are laboring to ensure that Americans can sign up for affordable health care. Again, it is more information about who is calling and what they are doing weekly rather than monthly will provide an additional workload for those who are trying to make sure that the Web sites are functioning for America.

It will actually make it harder for the Web sites to function by having to divert some effort if this were to become law simply to building reporting requirements that were mandated by Congress. It is almost as if this bill was designed to make the Web site work worse, Mr. Speaker, by moving developers and others, without any additional resources, away from making the necessary improvements towards building entirely new reporting systems just so people can have information weekly instead of monthly.

It would be great, first of all, to have information weekly. I would love to have information daily. I would love to have information realtime. I used to run an Internet company. It would be wonderful to have that information. You have to weigh the costs and benefits and say, Is it worth building into this system realtime reporting? What are we forgoing by doing that? Is it worth it to say we want the information weekly instead of monthly?

Again, if you are building it from scratch and perhaps if the Republicans had offered this as an amendment into the original Affordable Care Act, maybe this could have been incorporated in 3 years ago and we could have built a system with either realtime or weekly reporting. But here where we are today, clearly the top priority needs to be that this Web site works well for the American people so they can get affordable health care for themselves and their family. That is what the American people want.

Now, let's talk about security and safeguards for consumer information. Again, you have the germ of a good idea. Of course, when the government has our personal information, we need to make sure that there are adequate safeguards. That goes for the IRS, it goes for military personnel files, and it goes for the Affordable Care Act, just as we want to make sure that when the private sector and companies have our personal information that they institute the proper safeguards. And there are examples of failure. Mr. BURGESS mentioned Target as a private-sector example of failure.

We certainly hope that we have the infrastructure and security in place to ensure that there is not a failure of security with regard to the Affordable Care Act. But when we are talking about identity theft and how to address it, we need to look at where the real problem is. What is the leading cause of identity theft? Is it the IRS? Is it the Affordable Care Act? Is it the military? No. One of the biggest causes of breaches of personal information is our

broken immigration system, the fact that many immigrants in our country are here with fake paperwork, fraudulent Social Security numbers they have purchased or stolen—and H.R. 15, the bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform package, which in a very similar form has already passed the Senate, would address this.

So if we actually want to reduce identity theft and breaches of security and safeguard, Mr. Speaker, personal information for the American people, we should address the real problem rather than one of many hypothetical problems that, again, is no doubt worthy of discussion, but let's address where immigration—where identity theft actually occurs.

According to the Center for Immigration Studies, which has done a lot of work on identity theft from those who are here illegally, experts suggest that 75 percent of people who are here illegally and working use fraudulent Social Security cards to obtain employment. Again, Americans are the victims of this theft. Children are prime targets. Their report indicates that in Arizona it is estimated that there are thousands of children that are victims of identity theft. H.R. 15 contains mandatory E-Verify, which the Center for Immigration Studies says would curb and stop virtually 100 percent of child identity theft.

So, I mean, if we are serious, Mr. Speaker, about doing something about the fact that drivers licenses and Social Security numbers are being stolen, well, let's pass immigration reform. Let's make sure that people who are working in our country and have a role here have some kind of provisional work permit, some prospect of a pathway to citizenship over many years or decades, and that we have a mandatory E-Verify mechanism of checking, a way of verifying at the employer level that their paperwork is authentic and it is not, in fact, stolen from an innocent American, as it is today. So that would address identity theft. That would address fraud.

We have people today that actually, under our current laws, are incentivized to steal information—personal information—from American people. Our immigration system is clearly broken. We need to fix it. H.R. 15, the House's bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill, would create a mandatory employment eligibility verification program. Currently, only 7 percent of employers in our entire country are enrolled in E-Verify to do workplace authentication of those who work here.

So, let's bring this bill to the floor if that is the issue we want to address rather than discuss something that is hypothetically of concern. Yes, of course, we care about secure information in the Affordable Care healthcare.gov site. We care about it in military records, and we care about it in the IRS. But, meanwhile, there are hundreds of thousands of identities

being stolen every day, and that is going to continue because this body refuses to bring H.R. 15 to the floor of the House, which would make that number almost zero.

Mr. Speaker, the final bill that this rule brings to the floor is H.R. 2279, the Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations Act. It is really a package of three bills that would weaken hazardous waste laws like Superfund and the Resource Conservation Recovery Act. It would actually limit the EPA's oversight to ensure that the American people are safe and healthy.

Do we need to remind this body that the reason Congress enacted these safeguards and Superfund is because of tragedies like Love Canal where a residential neighborhood was built on top of 22,000 tons of hazardous waste, and due to the exposure, the residents suffered very high rates of miscarriages, cancers, and birth defects? The situation was so dire that the Federal Government wound up having to evacuate the entire community. That is not the America I want to live in, Mr. Speaker. I oppose H.R. 2279 because it could lead to more situations like Love Canal rather than making sure that the American people are safe and healthy in their homes.

Mr. Speaker, this debate is not really about reporting requirements. It is about making healthcare.gov function less effectively. It is not really about breaches of our personal information. We can solve a big chunk of that by bringing H.R. 15 to the floor of the House. It is not really about improving our competitiveness by removing unnecessary EPA regulations. It is about risking the health of our families.

We need to focus on rebuilding our infrastructure, fixing our broken immigration system, and making sure that we can protect the health of the American people, not jeopardize it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I now would like to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. COLLINS.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is a new year. We come down and begin this week, and I have made a commitment, as I think many of us do, as resolutions on what are we going to do for the new year and you always try to learn something new, and today has been a busy day with meetings and other things. I have learned a lot, but I have actually come to the floor today to learn something that was amazing to me, and it was not only that a bill that we are talking about under this rule would actually be designed to make, that was accused of making the ObamaCare Web site worse. I didn't know that was possible. And undoubtedly, it can be, but I think it actually helps when we look at what we are doing for the country and what we are doing as we move forward protecting the interests of the people.

So it is with that I rise in strong support of the rule and the underlying pieces of legislation, and in particular,

H.R. 3811, the Health Exchange Security and Transparency Act of 2014.

Even before ObamaCare was signed into law, pundits and politicians alike have speculated on the impact it would have on American families. Skyrocketing premiums, loss of coverage, and poor quality of care were all correctly predicted by many on this side of the aisle.

We come here today, however, because Americans aren't just faced with unaffordable health care and broken Presidential promises—the security and privacy of our personal information is at great risk due to ObamaCare.

One of the things that I think is mentioned here and should be noted, that protecting the information that is being forced to be given should be of our utmost importance and it is not something that should be just said is we should be doing other bills. Believe me, I would want to be talking about other things too, but this is something important that is protecting Americans' interests, and we need to continue to do so.

I believe that the best health care system is one that is patient centered and as far removed from the flawed policies enshrined in ObamaCare as possible. Over the upcoming months, I look forward to debating the merits of ObamaCare versus true health care reform with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. But today is not that day. Today we come to the floor simply to say that American families should know about breaches of personally identifiable information in the ObamaCare exchanges.

Regardless of the letter of your political affiliation, wouldn't you like to be notified if the security of your personal information has been compromised? If we get outside the politics of Washington and ask our constituents, I firmly believe that answer would be yes. It would actually be a resounding yes.

So as I come to speak in support of this rule, and speaking also with the underlying bills and especially when I believe something such as protecting the security of our personal information is so important, I believe it is also important for us to remember as we start a new year that when we come here, people listen, people are concerned about their lives, they are concerned about what has gone on.

And over the past few months, especially when it comes to health care, you can go to teachers in Georgia right now who have had their health care changed because of the ACA. That has just been an interesting mark everywhere I go in listening to people in what is now a health care system that they used to have their own insurance is now lost into something that they are struggling with; or whether it is the identifiable nature of the issues of their information on the Web site that possibly could be compromised, to just simply saying that we need regulations for our businesses and making sure our

environmental projects are the ones that are prioritized and not just simply at the whim of a certain administration priority.

□ 1300

What we have got to do here is to continue to look forward to doing the people's business and, in doing so, in such a way that matters to everyday Americans.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, again the gentleman said there is a risk of information being taken from the healthcare.gov site. There is potential risk from any site. But every day, there are tens of thousands of American identities being stolen because of this body's refusal to simply fix our broken immigration system now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, the majority has passed so few bills into law that it is on pace to become the least-productive Congress in history. And, frankly, I think they are a little bit proud of that. The inability to govern is directly related to the closed legislative process the majority has pursued with vigor over the course of the last year.

At the beginning of the second session of the 113th Congress, the majority has practically shuttered the doors of every committee, save for the Rules Committee. It is a rare day when a bill proceeds through regular order from a committee of jurisdiction to the Rules Committee and down to the House floor. In fact, during the first session of the 113th Congress, major legislation repeatedly originated in the Rules Committee and was rushed to the House floor for an up-or-down vote.

Furthermore, during the first congressional session, the majority relied upon closed rules to shut out the minority and diminish the chance of any compromise. Under a closed rule, no amendments are allowed on the House floor. That cuts out, Mr. Speaker, more than half of the people in the United States of America who voted for Democrats.

During 2013, the majority set new records by approving 19 closed rules in a single week and an unprecedented 11 closed rules in a single day. Even those with no interest in, or knowledge of, the legislative process can understand the impact that such a closed process has on our ability to govern.

Every Member of this Chamber was sent here with a simple duty—to represent our constituents to the best of our ability. But, by closing down the legislative process, the majority is preventing 200 duly elected Members of Congress from being able to do just that. Collectively, we members of the minority represent more than 142 million Americans. Each one of us is entrusted to work on their behalf. How can we do that when the majority takes away our ability to participate

in marking up legislation, amending bills, and having a full and open debate?

The Rules Committee has the unique and powerful ability to open up the legislative process and get Congress working again. In our committee, we can amend bills, improve legislation, and set the terms of debate so every Member of the House can participate in the legislative process. That is why I am so dismayed and somewhat disgusted at the proposed rule the Rules Committee has carried to the floor today.

Before us is a single resolution for three bills. Under this resolution, two of those bills are considered under closed rules, which are not amendable, not discussable, and one is considered under a structured rule. And that one came up 2 days ago. It has had no committee action whatsoever.

The bill being considered under a structured rule tries to revoke virtually all regulatory powers from the EPA, the agency that protects our health, our rivers, our air, and our land.

At the same time, one of the bills being considered under a closed rule adds layers of red tape to the Department of Health and Human Services and demands that health care navigators provide everything but their blood type and family history to Congress on an almost daily basis. It is simply designed to slow up the work of signing up Americans for the health care that they want and deserve.

It is very clear this bill is not a serious attempt to serve the American people but is a tactic to keep health care navigators from doing their work. Instead of moving forward with these go-nowhere bills, we should be extending unemployment insurance to the millions of Americans struggling to find work. And without unemployment insurance, the economy is suffering every single day.

Just before we left for Christmas, the last day we were here, to end the debate on the rule of the budget, we had a vote that we could have done to extend the unemployment during the rules debate on the floor. That was under the previous question. The vote failed despite the fact that every Democrat and a Republican voted for it.

By the way, this bill was paid for. It was already taken care of by excess payments that we pay in agriculture subsidies. It was an extension for 3 months, but that was not good enough. So today, you are going to have another chance to do just that, to extend the unemployment insurance, and I strongly urge my colleagues to do it.

If my colleagues will join me in voting "no" on the previous question, a 3-month extension of unemployment benefits will come to the floor for an immediate vote. This is the same bipartisan bill that is moving forward in the Senate, and it deserves the same consideration here in the House.

Today, more than 1.3 million Americans and their families have lost access

to unemployment insurance. Soon, it will be over 2 million and, by probably the end of March or May, 5 million. For so many, it is their only source of income and the only way they can pay their heating bills and buy food during these cold winter days.

We have to stand up for the millions of Americans struggling to get by through no fault of their own, because, you remember, in order to be eligible for unemployment insurance, you have to prove that you are looking for work. So I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question when it comes up so we can have an immediate vote to extend unemployment insurance and finally do something in this House and through this Rules Committee that will benefit Americans and make our constituents know that we count for something.

Mr. Speaker, The Majority has passed so few bills into law that it is on pace to become the least productive Congress in history. This inability to govern is directly related to the closed legislative process that the Majority has pursued with vigor over the course of the last year.

At the beginning of the 2nd Session of the 113th Congress, the Majority has practically shuttered the doors of every committee, save for the Rules Committee. It is a rare day when a bill proceeds through regular order—from a committee of jurisdiction to the Rules Committee and down to the House Floor. In fact, during the first session of the 113th Congress, major legislation repeatedly originated in the Rules Committee and was rushed to the House Floor for an up or down vote.

Furthermore, during the first Congressional session, the Majority relied upon closed rules to shut out the Minority and diminish the chance for compromise.

Under a closed rule, no amendments are allowed on the House Floor. During 2013, the Majority set new records by approving 19 closed rules in a single week and an unprecedented 11 closed rules in a single day!

Even those with no interest in, or knowledge of, the legislative process can understand the impact that such a closed process has on our ability to govern.

Every member of this chamber was sent here with a simple duty: to represent our constituents to the best of our ability.

Yet by closing down the legislative process, the Majority is preventing 200 duly elected Members of Congress from doing just that.

Collectively, we members of the Minority represent more than 142 million Americans. Each one of us has been entrusted to work on their behalf. How can we do that when the Majority takes away our ability to participate in marking up legislation, amending bills and having a full and open debate?

The Rules Committee has the unique and powerful ability to open up the legislative process and get Congress working again. In our committee we can amend bills, improve legislation, and set the terms of debate so that every Member of the House can participate in the legislative process.

That is why I am so dismayed at the proposed rule that the Majority in the Rules Committee has carried to the Floor today. Before us is a single resolution for three bills. Under this resolution, two bills will be considered

under closed rules and one will be considered under a structured rule.

The bill being considered under a structured rule tries to revoke virtually all regulatory powers from the EPA—the agency that protects our health, our rivers and our land.

At the same time, one of the bills being considered under a closed rule adds layers of red tape to the Department of Health and Human Services, and demands that healthcare navigators provide everything but their blood type and family history to Congress on an almost daily basis.

It is clear that this bill is not a serious attempt to serve the American people, but a tactic to keep healthcare navigators from providing millions of Americans with access to healthcare.

Instead of moving forward with these go-nowhere bills, we should be extending unemployment insurance to millions of Americans who are still struggling to find work.

Just before we left for Christmas, we had a vote on extending unemployment during a rules debate on the floor. That vote failed, despite the fact that every Democrat voted for it. As a result, more than 1.3 million Americans lost unemployment insurance on December 28th.

Today, we will give this chamber another chance to extend unemployment insurance—and I strongly urge my colleagues in doing just that.

If my colleagues will join me in voting “no” on the previous question, a 3-month extension of unemployment benefits will come to the floor for an immediate vote. This is the same bipartisan bill that is moving forward in the Senate, and it deserves the same consideration here in the House.

Right now, more than 1.3 million Americans have lost access to unemployment insurance in the last few weeks. For many, it is their only source of income and the only way they can pay their heating bills and stay warm during these cold winter days.

We must stand up for the millions of Americans who are struggling to get by in these tough economic times. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question so that we have an immediate vote to extend unemployment insurance and finally provide for the millions of Americans in need.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 16 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Colorado has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it is often said those who don't remember their history are doomed to repeat it.

The Rules Committee is an important function of this House. It is an important function of this body. Prior to 3 years ago, the Rules Committee was under the jurisdiction of the Democrats. They controlled the Rules Committee throughout the entirety of the 111th Congress. You may recall, that was the first 2 years of the first Obama term. In those 2 years under Speaker PELOSI, this was the first Congress in history—the first Congress in the history of the Republic—not to have a single bill considered under an open rule process.

Now, since Republicans resumed the majority at the beginning of 2011, 31 bills have come under an open rule. The track record may not be perfect, but it is inestimably better than what preceded it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would remind the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that this particular rule has two closed rules on two of the three bills.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the Rules Committee and thank Members on both sides of the aisle for their hard work, but I want to associate myself with Ranking Member SLAUGHTER for recognizing that we represent millions of people, and the constant closed-rule approach for bills that have not even been heard by committee makes it difficult to represent your constituents. So I associate myself with her plea for equity and comity.

I also ask that we recognize that 1.3 million and growing, 3.6 million, 4,000 a week, of the individuals who worked and invested in this Nation have received letters, like my constituent in Houston, letters with no offer of assistance but simply that your unemployment benefit, insurance benefit, has been canceled. Cancel your life, cancel your housing, cancel your food, cancel your medicine, cancel taking care of your children, cancel your life.

And so I believe that it is extremely important that we vote today—again—and we hope that we will draw bipartisan support, to avoid the loss of some 200,000 jobs, to avoid the loss of serving 20,000 military veterans who are in fact beneficiaries of unemployment insurance, 1.3 million Americans, 2 million children impacted, to avoid the loss to the American economy. Mr. Speaker, \$1.55 is generated by this insurance, millions of dollars to be lost.

And then I would say that it is important to be able to have a rule structure, more than a structured rule, more than a closed rule, because the bills that are before us today, the underlying bills, I am opposed to because my district is impacted by the Superfund.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman.

The three Superfund bills, no involvement of the Federal Government, taking authority away from the Federal Government, having the States override the Federal Government on Superfunds. There are neighborhoods that are still suffering.

And then with respect to this issue of privacy, I support the idea; but what I would say to my friends, and this privacy with healthcare.gov, what I would

say to my friends is that we cannot continue to chip away at a bill, the Affordable Care Act, where millions of people have received health care. Let's work to ensure privacy for all of the sites of the Federal Government. Let's not pick away at the Affordable Care Act, which has been documented that it is secure, healthcare.gov.

If Republicans wish to help make all of government secure, we are ready to do that, but what I would suggest is that this bill is not going in the right direction. I ask for a “no” vote on the rule and on the underlying bills.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I tire of going through this history lesson every time we come down to the floor, but may I remind you that when the now-Affordable Care Act was passed into law, this was a bill that came over to the House from the Senate. Sure enough, the House had sent the bill over to the Senate in July of 2009, H.R. 3590. It was a bill that dealt with housing. The bill that dealt with housing was amended. The amendment read, “Strike all after the enacting clause and insert,” and the health care language, which was de novo, the health care language was inserted.

Now, to be sure, the House had considered a health care reform bill, H.R. 3200. H.R. 3200 has gone to the ether of history. H.R. 3590 passed in the Senate, a 60-vote margin on Christmas Eve in 2009, and then was thrown over to the House of Representatives. Did we have a hearing on H.R. 3590 in the Committee on Energy and Commerce? No, we did not. Did they have a hearing in the appropriate subcommittee of Ways and Means on H.R. 3590, as amended? No, they did not.

The bill came to the Rules Committee. It came to the Rules Committee. I attempted to offer amendments. I was told, No, thank you. The bill was perfect the way it is, doesn't need any changes. This bill that affects every man, woman, and child in this country for the next three decades in a very unfavorable way was passed without any input from the then-minority, the Republicans in the House of Representatives.

So it is beyond comprehension that we can continue to have these arguments about closed processes. This, after all, is the granddaddy of all closed processes. And the consequence, the drafting errors, the problems embedded in the structure, could not be dealt with during the normal legislative process, which is why so much authority has been transferred to the executive branch, to the agencies, and why they are now essentially writing the laws that affect so many Americans.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1315

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I was listening as a student of history myself to our friend from Texas. In that little last bit about affordable health care, he left out one little piece of history, which was that the Republicans of both the Senate and the House, to a person, decided it a priority to oppose the health care reform act no matter what was in it.

To now come back and say we weren't given an opportunity to amend something that we decided we were going to oppose—remember Jim DeMint's words: if we can defeat this bill, it will be President Obama's Waterloo, no matter what is in it. So we need to remember history in its full context.

And speaking of history, knowing of my distinguished friend's love of it, it was almost 35 years ago when the 96th Congress answered the cries of communities across the country facing the life-threatening effects of hazardous toxic waste. Who can forget, speaking of history, the Love Canal disaster in New York or the Valley of the Drums in Kentucky, the unexplained increase in the incidence of cancer, birth defects, and miscarriages?

In an overwhelmingly bipartisan effort then, that Congress did the right thing by creating the Superfund program, offering communities a way to remediate contaminated sites, to protect public health, and hold polluters accountable.

The success of the Superfund is clear: according to the EPA, as of April of last year, remedial actions have been completed at more than 1,145 national priority list sites, and an additional 365 have been completely cleaned up and deleted from the list. That is called success. That is called a program that is working. That is 70 percent of the sites that had been added to the priority list.

Today, human exposure is under control at 1,361 priority sites and contaminated groundwater under control at 1,069 sites.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Yet, despite that success, with communities still in need, in process, the House majority wants to peel back that progress and repeal what we have done.

Can the Superfund be improved? Of course. We are committed to do that. But the answer isn't letting industry off the hook and leaving families exposed to hazardous waste and high cancer rates.

I urge defeat of this bill.

I thank my colleague for giving me the extra time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I would point out this bill before us today does not—does not—change the Superfund, but it does allow States the flexibility to deal with problems in their States as they see fit.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on this 50th anniversary of the war on poverty, 1.4 million Americans have lost emergency unemployment insurance and thousands more stand to lose it each day, each week, that Congress fails to act. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will allow the House to consider legislation that is identical to the bipartisan measure being considered in the Senate and would restore unemployment insurance to those who have lost it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), a leader in the effort to restore unemployment insurance, to discuss our proposal.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you, Mr. POLIS, for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in defeating the previous question, as my colleague said, so that we can immediately take up the question of the extension of emergency unemployment to millions of Americans who have lost their job and who are seeking to find their next opportunity to contribute to our economy and to support their families.

I am part of the freshman class. We just began our second year in Congress. Something about the 2012 class that I think defines us is that we believe that we were sent here by the electorate of 2012 not to posture, but to get things done, to take action, to solve problems. That is why myself and the rest of the Democratic freshman class yesterday sent a letter to Speaker BOEHNER asking that he immediately bring up an extension to the unemployment compensation for so many Americans.

Let's be clear about something, though. Unlike what I have heard from so many on the other side, being unemployed is not a choice; it is not a lifestyle to be sought. It is a condition that is often unanticipated, and it is one that nobody in my district that I know of who is unemployed would ever seek to try to maintain.

I can only speak for the people I represent, but I suspect this is true of my colleagues. Folks that we represent back home that are out of work would gladly, today, trade unemployment compensation for a job that puts them to work and gives them the dignity of work and the ability to meet their obligations to their family and their community. It is about survival. It is about making your rent payment. It is about being able to pay your car payment, to put food on the table for your kids. It is about being able to keep the house warm. It is not a lifestyle to be sought.

I think the notion that somehow people who are unemployed want to be there is condescending and offensive.

I urge my colleagues to join me in defeating this previous question so that we can immediately take up the work that the American people are asking us to take up.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. KILDEE. And that is to make sure that 1.3 million Americans have a chance to support their families until they can find meaningful work. Eleven million people since 2008 have been saved from poverty because of unemployment compensation. That unemployment extension was supported by the vast majority of Members of this House, signed by President Bush, with no strings attached.

What is different about 2014 than what was experienced in 2008? Nothing, except that we have the same obligation to those same Americans to make sure that they don't go broke, that they don't lose their house, that they don't lose their car, that they don't lose their family, as a result of the lack of basic decency.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I appreciate this opportunity to comment not only upon this rule which provides, of course, for mostly closed rules—no amendments, no ability to change or modify, particularly two bills that had no hearings, went to no committees, and were reported out doing stuff that we did for 2013 almost without exception—but what I really rise to say is that I want to urge every Member to vote against the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I know the American public will hear “previous question.” What does that mean? The previous question, if defeated, will give us the opportunity to put on this floor what the overwhelming majority of the American people want on this floor, which I understand the gentleman from Michigan, as I just was walking in, I think was talking about. That is to deal with the most pressing issue confronting this country right now today. That is that we have 1.3 million Americans who have simply been dropped through whatever safety net we thought we had constructed.

So, Mr. Speaker, the American public understands, the previous question will give us the opportunity, if it is defeated, to put that legislation on the floor now, to extend for those 1.3 million people the help of the American people who want to do it. In every poll they say, no, we ought to have this help.

When George W. Bush was President of the United States, five times we extended unemployment insurance for long-term unemployed—five times—without paying for it.

And make no mistake about it; the vote on the previous question is whether or not you want to give long-term unemployed who have lost their insurance and are having trouble putting food on their tables, if you want to give

them help, you will vote “no” on the previous question. Don’t hide behind a procedural issue. This is a substantive issue. This is an issue of whether we are going to give help now.

The American public that is for this ought to be looking at it. And every Member who votes “yes” on the previous question is voting not—not—to give help to those folks, 1.3 million of them, 20,000 veterans who can’t find a job. And there is only one job available for every three people that are looking for a job.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. That is why George W. Bush extended unemployment. That is why we ought to do it. And we can do it. We have the ability to do it. Vote “no” on the previous question. It is a substantive vote on whether or not you want to help the long-term unemployed who have lost, as of December 28, 3 days after Christmas, the season of giving and caring, whether you want to give them the unemployment insurance that they count on to feed themselves and their families and have their heads above water.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this rule and urge a vote instead to bring to the floor a bill introduced by the ranking member of the ways and means committee, my friend Mr. TIERNEY.

His bill will do what Congress ought to have done before we left for the holidays: extend the emergency unemployment insurance benefits that were cut off so suddenly for 1.3 million of our fellow citizens who are looking for work.

It is shameful that Republicans continue to block an extension of this lifeline for so many who are struggling to find jobs and are facing an extremely difficult job market, where in some places there are three job seekers for each open position.

Democrats will continue to put pressure on our colleagues across the aisle to work with us in a bipartisan way to extend these emergency benefits while our jobs recovery continues.

Representative TIERNEY’s bill would extend these benefits for three months to allow Congress time to work on a long-term solution.

There is no reason why 1.3 million people—a number that will grow by an average 72,000 a week for as long as Congress fails to act—should have to go without the emergency income that supports them and their families.

We need to promote job creation and get our people back to work, while at the same time ensuring that we’re helping people stay out of poverty.

I call on my Republican friends to join with us in extending these emergency benefits right now and then working together to invest in the economic competitiveness that will create the jobs we need.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In the last 12 days, nearly 1.4 million Americans have been cut off from their

emergency unemployment benefits. Thousands more Americans will lose their benefits every week without congressional action.

It is unforgivable that this Congress will adjourn tomorrow without addressing this crisis. Instead of offering a solution to extend emergency unemployment benefits, this rule does not allow us to address this critical issue of extending unemployment insurance immediately.

The longer we wait to fix this problem, the more serious it becomes for the long-term unemployed and their families. Punishing unemployed Americans and their families who have been hit hard in this tough recession through no fault of their own is just plain wrong.

My home State Senator, Senator JACK REED, has offered a proposal in the Senate. It is a critical step in the right direction to preserve this critical lifeline while we work on a long-term solution, and we should do the same thing here.

Surely my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want the opportunity to vote on extending unemployment insurance. So I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question, to defeat the previous question, so we can take up the issue of extending unemployment insurance for many Rhode Islanders and Americans all across this country who desperately need these benefits.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire, does the gentleman have any other speakers? If not, I am prepared to close.

Mr. POLIS. I am prepared to close.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” and defeat the previous question.

The Senate has passed a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration bill, and the Senate is debating unemployment insurance. Meanwhile, the House hasn’t dedicated a single second of legislative floor time to any immigration reform bill that would address identity theft.

Let’s move forward and pass bills that matter to the American people rather than political bills that aren’t going anywhere.

I urge a “no” vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, one of the questions for people who have been watching this debate, I’m sure one of the questions that they have, is there any difference as to

how the private sector is treated if and when a data breach occurs versus a Federal agency? The simple fact of the matter is there is a difference.

□ 1330

The private sector is governed under State laws and, yes, by some Federal regulations as well.

In fact, earlier this month, in a publication called *The Hill*, entitled, “Target’s data breach sparks calls for action,” there was significant discussion about, perhaps, there being more activity on the part of the Federal Trade Commission in protecting consumers who have been exposed to a data breach.

What are the protections for people harmed with a data breach by the Federal Government?

In fact, for that, there is not legislation, there is not a law that was signed by any administration, but there is an executive order of the President’s, dating from May 22, 2007, a so-called OMB Circular.

The OMB Circular dealing with data breaches under the section “Timeliness of the Notification” reads:

Agencies should provide notification without unreasonable delay following the discovery of a breach, consistent with the needs of law enforcement and national security and any measures necessary for your agency to determine the scope of the breach and, if applicable, to restore the reasonable integrity of the computerized data system compromise. Decisions to delay notification should be made by the agency head.

You get the impression that this is, perhaps, a rather open-ended or diffuse or poorly defined timeliness of notification for our constituents who are harmed by a data breach by a Federal agency. So that is one of the problems that we are here today to correct.

Today’s rule provides for the consideration of a critical jobs bill and critical security bills to clean up our environment and to protect Americans’ personal data.

I certainly want to thank Mr. GARDNER, Mr. TERRY and Chairman PTTTS for their thoughtful bills.

I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying pieces of legislation.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 455 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

Sec. 4 Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3824) to extend emergency unemployment benefits. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill

are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

Sec. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill as specified in section 4 of this resolution.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon re-

jection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote on the previous question. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 191, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—226

Aderholt	Duncan (SC)	Kelly (PA)
Amash	Duncan (TN)	King (IA)
Amodei	Ellmers	King (NY)
Bachmann	Farenthold	Kingston
Bachus	Fincher	Kinzinger (IL)
Barletta	Fitzpatrick	Kline
Barr	Fleischmann	Labrador
Benish	Fleming	LaMalfa
Bentivolio	Flores	Lamborn
Bilirakis	Forbes	Lance
Bishop (UT)	Portenberry	Lankford
Black	Fox	Latham
Blackburn	Franks (AZ)	Latta
Boustany	Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo
Brady (TX)	Gardner	Long
Bridenstine	Garrett	Lucas
Brooks (AL)	Gerlach	Luetkemeyer
Brooks (IN)	Gibbs	Lummis
Broun (GA)	Gibson	Marchant
Buchanan	Gingrey (GA)	Marino
Bucshon	Gohmert	Massie
Burgess	Goodlatte	McAllister
Byrne	Gosar	McCarthy (CA)
Calvert	Gowdy	McCauley
Camp	Granger	McHenry
Campbell	Graves (GA)	McKeon
Cantor	Graves (MO)	McKinley
Capito	Griffin (AR)	McMorris
Carter	Griffith (VA)	Rodgers
Cassidy	Grimm	Meadows
Chabot	Hall	Meehan
Chaffetz	Hanna	Messer
Coble	Harper	Mica
Coffman	Harris	Miller (FL)
Collins (GA)	Hartzer	Miller (MI)
Collins (NY)	Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary
Conaway	Hensarling	Mullin
Cook	Herrera Beutler	Mulvaney
Cotton	Holding	Murphy (PA)
Cramer	Hudson	Neugebauer
Crawford	Huelskamp	Noem
Crenshaw	Huizenga (MI)	Nugent
Culberson	Hultgren	Nunes
Daines	Hunter	Nunnelee
Davis, Rodney	Hurt	Olson
Denham	Issa	Palazzo
Dent	Jenkins	Paulsen
DeSantis	Johnson (OH)	Pearce
DesJarlais	Johnson, Sam	Perry
Diaz-Balart	Jordan	Petri
Duffy	Joyce	Pittenger

Pitts	Runyan	Tiberi
Poe (TX)	Ryan (WI)	Tipton
Pompeo	Salmon	Turner
Posney	Sanford	Upton
Price (GA)	Scalise	Valadao
Radel	Schock	Wagner
Reed	Schweikert	Walberg
Reichert	Scott, Austin	Walden
Renacci	Sensenbrenner	Walorski
Ribble	Sessions	Weber (TX)
Rice (SC)	Shimkus	Webster (FL)
Rigell	Shuster	Weststrum
Roby	Simpson	Westmoreland
Roe (TN)	Smith (MO)	Whitfield
Rogers (AL)	Smith (NE)	Williams
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (SC)
Rogers (MI)	Smith (TX)	Wittman
Rohrabacher	Southerland	Wolf
Rokita	Stewart	Womack
Rooney	Stivers	Woodall
Ros-Lehtinen	Stockman	Yoder
Roskam	Stutzman	Yoho
Ross	Terry	Young (AK)
Rothfus	Thompson (PA)	Young (IN)
Royce	Thornberry	

NAYS—191

Andrews	Garcia	Murphy (FL)
Barber	Grayson	Nadler
Barrow (GA)	Green, Al	Napolitano
Bass	Green, Gene	Neal
Beatty	Grijalva	Negrete McLeod
Becerra	Gutiérrez	Nolan
Bera (CA)	Hahn	O'Rourke
Bishop (GA)	Hanabusa	Owens
Bishop (NY)	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Blumenauer	Heck (WA)	Pascrell
Bonamici	Higgins	Pastor (AZ)
Brady (PA)	Himes	Payne
Braley (IA)	Hinojosa	Pelosi
Brown (FL)	Holt	Perlmutter
Brownley (CA)	Honda	Peters (CA)
Bustos	Horsford	Peters (MI)
Butterfield	Hoyer	Peterson
Capps	Huffman	Pingree (ME)
Capuano	Israel	Pocan
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Polis
Carney	Jeffries	Price (NC)
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Rahall
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Rangel
Castro (TX)	Keating	Richmond
Chu	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Ciulline	Kennedy	Sanchez, Loretta
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Clay	Kind	Schneider
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Schrader
Cohen	Kuster	Schwartz
Connolly	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Costa	Lee (CA)	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Levin	Shea-Porter
Crowley	Lewis	Sherman
Cuellar	Lipinski	Sinema
Cummings	Loebbeck	Sires
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Slaughter
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Smith (WA)
DeFazio	Lowey	Speier
DeGette	Lujan Grisham	Swalwell (CA)
Delaney	(NM)	Takano
DeLauro	Lujan, Ben Ray	Thompson (CA)
DelBene	(NM)	Thompson (MS)
Deutch	Lynch	Tierney
Dingell	Maffei	Titus
Doggett	Maloney,	Tonko
Doyle	Carolyn	Tsongas
Duckworth	Maloney, Sean	Van Hollen
Edwards	Matheson	Vargas
Ellison	Matsui	Veasey
Engel	McCollum	Vela
Enyart	McDermott	Velázquez
Eshoo	McGovern	Vislousky
Esty	McIntyre	Walz
Farr	McNerney	Wasserman
Fattah	Meeks	Schultz
Foster	Meng	Waters
Frankel (FL)	Michaud	Waxman
Fudge	Miller, George	Welch
Gallego	Moore	Wilson (FL)
Garamendi	Moran	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Barton	Guthrie	McClintock
Cleaver	Heck (NV)	Ruiz
Cole	Jones	
Gabbard	McCarthy (NY)	

Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)

Sánchez, Linda
T.
Schiff

□ 1356

Messrs. JEFFRIES, VELA, and NADLER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 5, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 223, noes 186, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

AYES—223

Aderholt	Foxx	McAllister
Amash	Franks (AZ)	McCarthy (CA)
Amodei	Frelinghuysen	McCaul
Bachmann	Gardner	McHenry
Bachus	Garrett	McIntyre
Barletta	Gerlach	McKeon
Barr	Gibbs	McKinley
Benishek	Gibson	McMorris
Bentivolio	Gingrey (GA)	Rodgers
Bilirakis	Gohmert	Meadows
Bishop (UT)	Goodlatte	Meehan
Black	Gosar	Messer
Blackburn	Gowdy	Mica
Boustany	Granger	Miller (FL)
Brady (TX)	Graves (GA)	Miller (MI)
Bridenstine	Graves (MO)	Miller, Gary
Brooks (AL)	Griffin (AR)	Mullin
Brooks (IN)	Griffith (VA)	Mulvaney
Broun (GA)	Grimm	Murphy (PA)
Buchanan	Hall	Neugebauer
Bucshon	Hanna	Noem
Burgess	Harper	Nugent
Byrne	Harris	Nunnelee
Calvert	Hartzler	Olson
Camp	Hastings (WA)	Palazzo
Campbell	Hensarling	Paulsen
Cantor	Herrera Beutler	Pearce
Capito	Holding	Perry
Carter	Hudson	Petri
Cassidy	Huelskamp	Pittenger
Chabot	Huizenga (MI)	Pitts
Chaffetz	Hultgren	Poe (TX)
Coble	Hunter	Pompeo
Coffman	Hurt	Posey
Collins (NY)	Issa	Price (GA)
Conaway	Jenkins	Radel
Cook	Johnson (OH)	Reed
Cotton	Johnson, Sam	Reichert
Cramer	Jordan	Renacci
Crawford	Joyce	Ribble
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Rice (SC)
Culberson	King (IA)	Rigell
Daines	King (NY)	Roby
Davis, Rodney	Kingston	Roe (TN)
Denham	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (AL)
Dent	Kline	Rogers (MI)
DeSantis	Labrador	Rohrabacher
DesJarlais	LaMalfa	Rokita
Diaz-Balart	Lamborn	Rooney
Duffy	Lance	Ros-Lehtinen
Duncan (SC)	Lankford	Roskam
Duncan (TN)	Latham	Ross
Ellmers	Latta	Rothfus
Farenthold	LoBiondo	Royce
Fincher	Long	Runyan
Fitzpatrick	Lucas	Ryan (WI)
Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Salmon
Fleming	Lummis	Sanford
Flores	Marchant	Scalise
Forbes	Marino	Schock
Fortenberry	Massie	Schweikert

Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman

Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)

NOES—186

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al

Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsock
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano

NOT VOTING—23

Barton
Becerra
Cárdenas
Castro (TX)
Cleaver
Cole
Collins (GA)
Fattah

Gabbard
Guthrie
Heck (NV)
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
Nunes
Rogers (KY)

□ 1406

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)

□ 1409

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2279) to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act relating to review of regulations under such Act and to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 relating to financial responsibility for classes of facilities, with Mr. YODER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of the amendment to H.R. 2279, the Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations, or REDO, Act of 2013, which also includes my legislation, H.R. 2226, the Federal and State Partnership for Environmental Protection Act, and Mr. LATTA's bill, H.R. 2318, the Federal Facility Accountability Act of 2013.

Our goal with all three of these bills is to modernize some of the environmental laws that we oversee and make sure that the States are playing a significant role in implementing them. To do that, we began this Congress with a hearing on the role of the States in protecting the environment. State environmental protection officials shared their experience and expertise with us and helped us better understand the complex partnership between the States and the Federal Government as States implement Federal laws, such as the Solid Waste Disposal Act, and the EPA implements the Comprehensive

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 6, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

REDUCING EXCESSIVE DEADLINE OBLIGATIONS ACT OF 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2279.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 455 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2279.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1409

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2279) to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act relating to review of regulations under such Act and to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 relating to financial responsibility for classes of facilities, with Mr. YODER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of the amendment to H.R. 2279, the Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations, or REDO, Act of 2013, which also includes my legislation, H.R. 2226, the Federal and State Partnership for Environmental Protection Act, and Mr. LATTA's bill, H.R. 2318, the Federal Facility Accountability Act of 2013.

Our goal with all three of these bills is to modernize some of the environmental laws that we oversee and make sure that the States are playing a significant role in implementing them. To do that, we began this Congress with a hearing on the role of the States in protecting the environment. State environmental protection officials shared their experience and expertise with us and helped us better understand the complex partnership between the States and the Federal Government as States implement Federal laws, such as the Solid Waste Disposal Act, and the EPA implements the Comprehensive

Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, or CERCLA or Superfund law, and the relation to State environmental protection laws.

Today we consider three bills that are a logical outgrowth of that discussion. The Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations, or REDO, Act of 2013 would give EPA flexibility by correcting two arbitrary action deadlines that were written into the Solid Waste Disposal Act and CERCLA many years ago.

RCRA contains a mandate that EPA review and, if necessary, revise all RCRA regulations every 3 years. This deadline is unnecessary and unworkable in the face of the significant number of regulations that currently exist under RCRA.

The bill would allow the Administrator to review and, if necessary, revise regulations as she thinks appropriate. The bill would also lift an action deadline in CERCLA requiring EPA to identify, prior to 1984, classes of facilities for which to develop financial assurance regulations.

□ 1415

More than 30 years passed without action from the EPA to promulgate regulations regarding financial assurance. A lawsuit and court order finally prompted the EPA action just a few years ago.

In the meantime the States and other Federal agencies have long since acted, putting in place strong financial assurance requirements of their own. That is why the bill also provides that if EPA does get around to establishing Federal financial assurance regulations, the States requirements would not be preempted.

The bill also requires the EPA to gather information regarding the financial assurance programs of States and other Federal agencies and report to Congress regarding whether there is a need for additional regulations by the EPA.

Should the EPA determine there is a need for additional requirements, the bill ensures compliance with existing State or Federal requirements will count towards compliance with EPA's requirements.

The Federal Facility Accountability Act would bring the CERCLA waiver of sovereign immunity into conformity with the Solid Waste Disposal Act, and for that matter the Clean Air Act, by requiring that all Federal Superfund sites comply with the same State laws and regulations as a private entity. This is not a new concept.

Legislation has been introduced previously by my friends across the aisle to ensure that Federal agencies comply with all Federal and State environmental laws, including CERCLA.

In fact, the Federal Facilities Compliance Act of 1991 had the same goal: to make Federal facilities subject to all the same substantive and procedural requirements, including enforcement requirements and sanctions that

State and local governments and private companies meet.

The Federal Facility Accountability Act applies the same policy to Federal facilities under CERCLA that already applies to Federal facilities under the Solid Waste Disposal Act. Some argue that if this bill becomes law it will change Federal agencies' spending by forcing them to comply with State laws and that CERCLA is different because it is retroactive and applies to prior actions of the Federal Government.

The Solid Waste Disposal Act often applies to past conduct. That's why there is a provision for "corrective measures." In fact, the EPA has issued multiple guidance documents that describe how Federal agencies should harmonize RCRA and CERCLA with respect to cleanups of hazardous waste.

Past conduct, future conduct—the fairness principle is the same. The basic question is whether Federal agencies should comply with State environmental protection laws just as private companies and State and local agencies must do.

My bill, the Federal and State Partnership for Environment Protection Act, does exactly what the title implies and would go a long way toward making the States partners with the EPA in cleaning up hazardous waste sites.

CERCLA is implemented by the EPA, but often States are in the best position to understand the sites in their State. This bill would allow States to play a larger role in the CERCLA process in several ways. The bill would allow States to list a site that it believes needs to be on the National Priorities List every 5 years and would provide transparency to the States if they suggest a site for listing.

The bill would also allow States to be consulted before the EPA selects a remedial action.

States are on the front lines and understand at the ground level how to prioritize environmental actions within their States.

They often come up with innovative solutions that better fit the local problem. We heard examples of that in our hearing on the Role of the States in Protecting the Environment.

CERCLA is a key example of a statute passed more than 30 years ago that we can now update and strengthen the Federal-State partnership to get sites cleaned up.

Removing barriers to job creation imposed by Federal Government is a cornerstone in our governing philosophy. CORY GARDNER, BOB LATTA and I produced bills to ensure that the Federal Government reduces unnecessary red tape, the barriers to job creation, while still keeping our environment healthy. These important bills aim to improve the Federal and State relationship when dealing with hazardous waste.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Washington, DC, January 8, 2014.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington,
DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON, I am writing with respect to H.R. 2279, the "Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations Act of 2013."

As you know, H.R. 2279 contains provisions within the Committee on the Judiciary's Rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite the House's consideration of H.R. 2279, the Committee on the Judiciary will not assert a jurisdictional claim over this bill by seeking a sequential referral. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding and agreement that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 2279, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration of H.R. 2279.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Washington, DC, January 8, 2014.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on Judiciary,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington,
DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE, Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2279, the "Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations Act of 2013." As you noted, there are provisions of the bill that fall within the Committee on the Judiciary's Rule X jurisdiction.

I appreciate your willingness to forgo action on H.R. 2279, and I agree that your decision is not a waiver of any of the Committee on the Judiciary's jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward. In addition, I understand the Committee reserves the right to seek the appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, for which you will have my support.

I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 2279 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

At a time when too many of our citizens are still out of work, our Nation's infrastructure is in need of repair, the Tax Code needs revision, and when the safety net that provides basic necessities for our citizens has a tragic number of holes to close, we are spending our time on yet another bill that is headed straight for the legislative dust bin.

It was the high-profile contamination at Love Canal in my home State of New York back in 1978 that motivated Congress to address the serious public

health threat that existed at many sites across this country. Toxic contamination of air, of water, and of land from the improper handling of disposal of hazardous materials.

Many of us represent districts that have formerly contaminated sites or sites that still remain to be cleaned up.

Superfund is not a perfect law, but it has, in combination with other environmental laws, returned many abandoned, contaminated sites to productive use.

When contaminated, blighted land is transformed, the entire community benefits. A long-abandoned former industrial site along the riverfront in my district was restored to a popular park. The residents of Amsterdam now enjoy a beautiful waterfront area.

H.R. 2279 does nothing to improve public health or create jobs or protect the environment or avoid needless public expenses. In fact, it does the opposite.

Title I of this bill further delays actions that should have been taken years ago. Congress included broad authorities for the Environmental Protection Agency to ensure that businesses that handle hazardous substances were financially able to deal with contamination that might result from their activities. This provision remains essential to protecting taxpayer interests, and it ensures these businesses are acting responsibly.

EPA's goals within the Superfund program should not stop at cleaning up the legacy sites that we have. It should also prevent new sites from being contaminated. It should prevent more people from being exposed to toxic substances, and it should prevent the property damage, loss of revenue, and stigma that communities experience when they are marred by these sites.

H.R. 2279 blocks the Environmental Protection Agency from implementing financial responsibility standards that their inspector general's office and the Government Accountability Office have advised are prudent actions that will avoid unnecessary public expenditures to clean up contaminated sites.

The GAO's last report on this topic indicated that in the 10-year period they examined, Federal agencies spent \$2.6 billion to reclaim abandoned hard-rock mine sites on Federal, State, private, and tribal lands.

So how does H.R. 2279 address this potential \$100 million per year liability? By blocking EPA from taking recommended steps to avoid these potential cleanup costs. We cannot afford to continue this destructive policy.

Under the guise of "fiscal responsibility," the majority voted to expand the list of requirements for applicants to the food stamp program to include drug testing and work requirements in addition to the detailed examination of an applicant's financial assets already required—all this to avoid providing a subsidy of about \$1.50 per meal.

Apparently, it is too much to ask that a business, which could expose

communities to toxic contamination, leave taxpayers with cleanup costs in the tens of millions of dollars, and result in lost local revenue and loss of property values, provide the government with assurance that it can afford to properly manage or clean up contamination that it created. The inconsistency in these policy choices is, indeed, incredible.

Blocking EPA from instituting basic requirements to protect public health, community vitality, local economic interests, and taxpayer interests provides a massive subsidy to a polluter at great public expense.

Titles II and III of this bill are somewhat of a mystery. I have no idea what problems with the Superfund program they propose to fix, but we have heard from the administration about serious problems this bill would, indeed, create.

The proponents of this legislation claim that title II will provide States more funding, give States a greater role in cleanups, and improve cooperation between States and the Federal Government on site cleanups, but States already have a significant role. Under current law, States can assert greater control over cleanups through a variety of mechanisms if they wish to do so.

The provisions altering the relationship between Federal and State government have a number of serious problems. For example, title III creates situations in which Federal employees could find themselves in a legal mess if caught between conflicting State and Federal direction of a cleanup site. This is an issue that was raised when this bill was considered by the committee. It was not resolved in committee, and it was not resolved before coming here to the House floor.

This is not the first bill this House has considered that demonstrated a disregard for Federal workers. This House has repeatedly turned to Federal workers to shoulder an unfair amount of the burden of deficit reduction.

Our erratic appropriation process has made their jobs more difficult, even as we have reduced their benefits and frozen their salaries.

We shut down the government, creating tremendous uncertainty for their families and barring people from their workplace. Now we are poised to pass a bill that might result in Federal workers being put in jail for doing their job.

Mr. Chair, I have touched on a few of the problems with this legislation. This is a poorly crafted bill that offers nothing for the public. It will not speed cleanups. It will not save money. It will not improve public health. This is bad policy and poorly crafted legislation. With that, I urge my colleagues to reject it.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2279 and specifically a section of the bill I sponsored referred to as the Federal Facility Accountability Act. This commonsense legislation updates CERCLA to ensure that Federal facilities are held to the same level of accountability as private facilities when it comes to cleaning up the release of hazardous substances. This legislation is supported by a number of State entities that have had numerous problems with Federal facilities skirting their CERCLA cleanup responsibilities.

As the Department of Environmental Conservation Contaminated Sites program in Alaska pointed out during one of our subcommittee hearings, a recurring problem is when Federal entities use sovereign immunity as a bar to limit or even refute State involvement and oversight of agency cleanups. In these instances, the Federal agency is acting as the responsible party and the regulator in which they get to determine which laws to apply, how safe the remedy needs to be, and they also pay the bill. Further, there is inconsistency in how some Federal agencies apply their CERCLA authority.

The Federal Facilities Accountability Act addresses these concerns and existing ambiguities by ensuring current and formerly owned Federal facilities will have to comply with the same State requirements as a private entity doing cleanup under CERCLA and specifically identifies the types of State procedural and substantive requirements that are applicable to the Federal Government.

Some of the most pressing environmental problems exist at current and former Federal facilities, and States have come a long way in developing strong regulatory programs to protect public health, safety, and the environment. It makes sense for Federal agencies to comply with these State environmental laws and to clean up contamination at Federal facilities to the same standards as everyone else.

With strong independent State enforcement authority, the environmental performance of Federal agencies will undoubtedly improve.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2279.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I now yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the former chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and a staunch defender in public policy and outspoken word for the environment.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from New York (Mr. TONKO) for yielding and for his kind words.

Today the House is considering legislation to reduce the number of cleanups of dangerous contaminated sites that can occur each year. It is reducing the number of cleanups. At the same time, it is raising the cost to the taxpayers and letting polluters escape responsibility.

This bill is a perfect illustration of what is wrong with the House of Representatives. It is a partisan bill, developed through an insufficient committee process that erodes landmark public health protections for the benefit of big polluters.

When I first learned that the committee was considering this legislation to address the cleanup of contaminated sites on Federal land, I was hopeful that this was an issue that could be pursued on a bipartisan basis. We should always be looking for ways to improve our laws, to be more careful and effective in the use of taxpayer dollars, and to better protect public health and the environment. But the Energy and Commerce Committee leadership refused to work with the stakeholders to develop a workable and credible proposal.

□ 1430

The Department of Justice and Department of Defense both offered to come help us craft new and effective policies, but the chairman of the subcommittee refused to even meet with them.

Even worse, after the hearing on the bill, where a bill was out there, we had a hearing on it, the House Republicans added provisions that would let private companies avoid accountability for the pollution they cause. That means we are voting on legislation today to create new hurdles for holding polluters accountable, and we have no legislative record to explain it.

The outcome of enacting this bill should be obvious. If polluters don't pay to clean up their pollution, then it just becomes one more burden on the taxpayer. And none of us should want that.

This is the continuation of a disturbing trend. Over the last 3 years under Republican control, the House has voted over 400 times to weaken environmental laws. Last year, the House voted 51 times to benefit the oil and gas industry. From gutting laws that fight climate change to repealing rules that cut toxic air pollution, the House Republican leadership appears to have no qualms about targeting any public health and environmental protection.

The House Republicans seem to have forgotten we represent all of the American people. We represent the parents who want to know that their children are not being exposed to cancer-causing pollution. We represent taxpayers who don't want to spend millions to clean up a polluted industrial site simply because a big corporation decided to walk away. And, yes, we even represent the Federal employees who shouldn't have to face the threat of State sanctions just for doing their job and following the law as they would under this bill.

The administration strongly opposes this bill because it could delay cleanup of contaminated sites with the most urgent human health and safety risks. All of the Democrats on the Energy

and Commerce Committee voted against these bills that have been combined and are being presented to us today. We all oppose it because it will increase litigation and let polluters off the hook. This bill would be vetoed if it ever made its way to the President's desk. Most likely it will never see the light of day in the other House.

This bill might play well with some special interest groups, but it should never become law; and I urge all Members to oppose this legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have to respond, I think, briefly. I appreciate the ranking member's passion in addressing these issues, but we need to clear up what some of the facts actually are.

CBO has scored these bills and has come back and said that there are no significant cost increases associated with these. Furthermore, in regards to meeting with the Department of Justice and the Department of Defense, that meeting did occur, and the concerns that they raised were mainly around criminal liabilities for Federal employees, and that was addressed in the final legislation. So I'm not sure why we are still debating those issues.

At this time, I would like to yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER).

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his leadership in managing this legislation today. I also thank the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. SHIMKUS of Illinois, for his fine work on this legislation.

I am rising today in support of H.R. 2279, the Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations Act, a package of bills, as we have discussed, which includes the Federal Facility Accountability Act by Mr. LATTA from Ohio and the Federal and State Partnership for Environmental Protection Act by Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

This legislation represents steps to roll back unnecessary and overburdensome regulations that are duplicative and unnecessary. The bills are aimed to protect the State-Federal partnership when it comes to cleaning up hazardous waste sites as quickly and as efficiently as possible. Solid waste must be disposed of in a responsible, efficient, and environmentally friendly manner; but there is no need for overly burdensome regulations that put a strain on businesses.

While our economy continues to sputter along, commonsense revisions of rules and regulations are a vital and critical component of helping our State and local economies grow.

My bill, the REDO Act, does two things. It allows the EPA the authority to revise and review the Resource Conservation Recovery Act, or RCRA, regulations as appropriate instead of every 3 years as required under current law. Even the EPA in written testimony to the Energy and Commerce Committee said that this regulation—the regulation that we are changing—can pose a significant resource burden

on the EPA, given the complexity and volume of EPA's RCRA regulations.

Again, the EPA has problems with the rule. We are simply trying to change the rule to give them the power to meet the rule, and that is why it is all the more surprising that the President would issue a veto threat over a regulation that his own agency has written testimony saying they can't comply with it and have problems with it.

This bill also provides that when the EPA promulgates a financial responsibility requirement, existing State or Federal requirements are not preempted and EPA's requirement will fill whatever gap may be left by the requirements set forth by States and other Federal agencies. If EPA does revise requirements, they must submit a report to Congress explaining their justification for doing so.

It is a commonsense bill, commonsense jobs legislation; and I urge this Chamber's support.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. I thank you for yielding so I can correct the record.

Bipartisan staff on our committee met with the Department of Justice and the Department of Defense to hear a long list of objections they had to the bill that was before the markup in committee. When we went into the markup in committee, I personally asked in the public session if Chairman SHIMKUS, the chairman of the subcommittee, would meet personally with the Department of Justice and Department of Defense because they had great concerns about the bill. He said at that markup that he would.

We checked with the Department of Defense, we checked with the Department of Justice, and there has been no such meeting. There has been some change, but they have not really addressed all the issues that I think Members should have been taking into consideration. There was really not an attempt, if the gentleman would permit, to work this out on a bipartisan basis, to hear what other people had to say about it. This bill was driven through and was being written whether we had a hearing, written after the hearings where they had a markup, written after the markup without getting all the facts; and it is a flawed bill as a result of it.

Thank you for yielding to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I'm proud at this point to yield 3 minutes to my good friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Section 106 of this bill requires that the owners and operators of facilities holding certain quantities of materials that are included on the Department of Homeland Security's Chemicals of Interest list report those materials to

their State emergency response commissions. And while it is absolutely imperative that State and local authorities are properly informed about potential hazards in their communities, we have to be sure to communicate this information in the most secure, responsible, and effective way.

As chairman of the Homeland Security Committee's Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies, this provision concerns me for two particular reasons. First, the President has already specifically asked several Federal agencies—this is the Department of Homeland Security; the Environmental Protection Agency; and ATF, Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms—to assess the feasibility of sharing this kind of information with the emergency response commissions while they are actually engaged in this activity.

Section 106 effectively mandates that they share this information immediately—before the President has had a chance to make his determination. And with sensitive information about the amount, variety and location of potentially dangerous materials at issue, this directive raises serious security concerns.

Second, the DHS Chemicals of Interest list is specific to the Chemical Facilities Anti-Terrorism Standards program. CFATS has in place a required practice of sharing information in a way that ensures facility security. I have serious reservations about whether this sensitive information could become compromised or subject to broad dissemination if section 106 were to become law. Chemical security is the responsibility of the Department of Homeland Security, which is specifically equipped to protect it.

Because these concerns have yet to be addressed, I request that the committee revisit section 106 during conference with the Senate.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

Mr. SHIMKUS. I thank my colleague, my friend from Pennsylvania, for calling attention to this concern that you raised.

In our open, deliberative process which we had in the markup, this was added as an amendment to the bill by my friends on the other side. This was prior to the President's rollout of his working group, prior to the President's stated concern about the sensitive nature of this information; and so it is one of the few times I would agree with the President that this information is very, very sensitive. So it might have been inappropriate at that time to accept this portion of the bill.

In our view, protecting this information, especially keeping it away from terrorists, is of utmost concern; and I want to assure you that this will be our guiding principle as we consider whether to include section 106 or any version of it in the final draft of the legislation.

Mr. MEEHAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the chairman emeritus of the Energy and Commerce Committee and also the longest-serving Member of the House, my good friend from the State of Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), who was at the table in 1980 to oversee the Superfund and knows more about the Superfund than perhaps anyone in the House.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank my dear friend from New York. I commend him for his outstanding service, and I appreciate his yielding this time to me.

Well, we have a bad bill on the floor. Frankly, I am embarrassed; and if I was one of the Republican managers of this bill, I would have a red face. Quite honestly, it does nothing except expose Federal employees to liability for actually enforcing the law.

No oversight was conducted to bring about the consideration of this legislation. No opportunity was made for the agencies to come forward and fully set out their concerns about how this bill is a bad piece of legislation.

As the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, I handled the Superfund amendments in the reauthorization acts earlier. In that effort, it was a fully bipartisan undertaking, and we worked very closely with the Reagan administration, which was present and involved in all the conference meetings. The Senate at that time was under Republican control. President Reagan signed the act on October 17, 1986, after overwhelming votes of 386-27 in the House and 88-8 in the Senate.

At the one hearing that we had on this bill, I did not hear any support from the majority's witnesses. Most of them seemed to be somewhat embarrassed about the legislation and were unable to tell us anything that the legislation would accomplish in the public good or towards speeding up or improving the enforcement of Superfund.

It was interesting to note that there was really no identification of what the legislation would do to cure the problems that we confront with regard to Superfund. The Superfund program has been a fine example of success after having had a rocky start, and we have seen substantial completion of construction activities at over 70 percent of the national priority sites. Thousands of other shorter-term actions have also been completed.

Before charging headlong into solving problems that are not backed up with a factual record and with no showing whatsoever of a need for the legislation, I recommend that this body first gather the evidence that it needs from EPA, from States, from local governments, from industry and communities to better understand what, if any, problems need to be addressed. Until then, I fail to understand the purpose of this legislation other than a device to provide work for members of staff, to obfuscate the enforce-

ment of Superfund and to, quite frankly, ignore the real problems which exist.

Superfund is cursed with the fact that it has major difficulty in being properly funded because the funding for it has long since expired, and now the ability of the Nation to fund the cleanup is not available to us. This bill would do nothing to address any of the problems that are there to be seen. It is a bad bill. It should be rejected.

□ 1445

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased now to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), our chairman.

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, well, it is great to be here on the floor with my friends as we talk about moving pieces of legislation. It is unfortunate that we are no longer a debating society; we are just a statement society, whether we are going back to what is true and right in language of the bill or what is not.

Let me talk to folks about how we got to this position.

Upon becoming subcommittee chairman in the last Congress, I talked to members of my committee and staff and I said, There is no perfect piece of legislation. There is no perfect piece of law. What are some things that we can fix to make this process go better?

And it wasn't just our ideas; we went to the States. The States have a huge responsibility. And I think if people watched the body of information of what is coming out of our committee, we have given a lot of deference to the States because they are the ones who live closest to these locations. So we bring in the Council of the States, the Environmental Council of the States and all the stakeholders and we say, What is it about the Federal law that drives you crazy and if we fixed it would make your life better? Hence, these three pieces of legislation that have been rolled into one bill to make it to the floor.

The Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations Act, it allows the EPA to review regulations on solid waste disposal only when necessary. You know what the law says; regardless if the law works or not, you have to review it every 3 years. And you know what happens when that law is in there; regardless if it works, regardless if there are no complaints, you have to review it. So that is ripe for litigation. You don't do it within the time line, whether you need to or not, let's sue and settle. Let's do something.

So all we are saying is, if the law works, if the regulations are good, if there are no complaints, don't have an automatic time line of having to review it in 3 years. The States said, Yes, we would like that because we are spending more time.

Part of the problem with the Superfund is huge amounts of money go to

litigation. Surprise, surprise. We want to get money away from litigation to remediation. That is all we are trying to do.

The bill also requires EPA, prior to developing new financial responsibility requirements—and that is the key. What is a financial responsibility requirement? What do you have to have available if you are going to do this site and in case something goes wrong and you need cleanup? What are the financial requirements? What is the bonding you need? All we are saying is don't change the rules. And if you are going to change the rules for financial bonding while the process and the site is being operated, wouldn't it be good to talk to the States and let people know that the Federal Government is going to change the rules in the operation of a new site? The States said, Good idea. You ought to look at that.

One other part of the bill is the Federal and State Partnership for Environmental Protection Act of 2013, which requires the EPA to consult with States when undergoing a removal action. So usually what happens at a Superfund site, the Federal Government gets involved. They are going to help do the majority of the cleanup. But guess who has the long-term observation and administration costs of the site? The States do. All we are saying is, if we are going to start to remediate in a State, let's have the State sit down and work with the EPA so the State knows its long-term costs. Pretty simple.

And the last one, which I always find pretty amazing that my friends on the other side are arguing about, protecting the Federal Government to pollute. All we are saying is, when the Federal Government has polluted a site, the Federal Government ought to clean it up. We make everyone else do it. We hold everyone else responsible. But no, if the Federal Government has polluted, we give them immunity. Sovereign immunity. They don't have to do anything. So this law says that it is about time the Federal Government comply with the same laws that States do and other individuals do.

This is a position my colleagues have had for many, many years. And of all the portions of this bill that I thought that they would be all for is moving this position that the Federal Government should comply with the same laws as everyone else does. And for my colleagues on the other side to protect governmental polluters I just find is unbelievable.

So the process was good. We had hearings. We had markups. We had amendments agreed to. I am proud of my colleagues in bringing these bills to the floor. I am glad of the participation by the States, and I look forward to the moving of the bill.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, before I yield, I would like to make a few comments.

I keep hearing from the bill's supporters that the States need and want

this legislation. I am a little confused by those statements. My staff called the Association of State and Territorial Solid Waste Management Officials, and they do not support the legislation. We also called the Environmental Council of the States, which represents the State environmental commissioners, and they have not endorsed the instant legislation before the House. So I am somewhat confused by the statements being made here.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), who has fought for many environmental causes through the committee on behalf of his home State of New Jersey and, for that matter, for this Nation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague from New York, the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 2279. This is an unnecessary and ill-advised piece of legislation that would significantly weaken our country's hazardous waste laws and further shift the burden of cleaning up these sites from the entities responsible for the contamination to the taxpayer instead.

Mr. Chairman, polluters are already not paying their fair share to help clean up America's worst toxic sites, and this bill only makes things worse. Since 1995 when the Superfund taxes expired, taxpayers have shouldered an unreasonable responsibility to pay for these cleanups. I have a bill, the Superfund Polluter Pays Act, which would reauthorize the original Superfund fees and make polluters, not taxpayers, pay the costs of cleaning up Superfund sites. Congress needs to reinstate the "polluter pays" taxes so the industries most responsible for polluting our land and water are held responsible for cleaning up our toxic legacy, a legacy which severely affects my home State of New Jersey.

But again we face the prospect of the Republican majority dismantling our Nation's critical environmental laws. The bill before us today is really a combination of three bills, all of which will hinder hazardous cleanup across the country. And I am especially troubled by provisions in the bill that enable sites to veto sites from being added to the Superfund National Priorities List, as well as the provision that weakens the requirement for companies who deal with hazardous materials to carry insurance to cover contamination threats. Absent this insurance requirement, it will be easier for a company to go bankrupt and shirk its responsibility to clean up contamination that it has caused.

Mr. Chairman, cleaning up Superfund sites creates jobs by converting the contaminated areas into productive land ready for redevelopment and employing engineers, construction workers, and others engaged in the cleanup. I have seen this in my home State. New Jersey has more Superfund sites than any other State, and my county of

Middlesex actually has more sites than any other county. But we have cleaned up a lot of these sites and created jobs. They are now used for recreation, for manufacturing, for shopping centers, so many other things.

We don't want to weaken the Superfund law. That would be a huge mistake. So I urge all of my colleagues to vote "no" on this legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, just a couple of quick points of clarification.

My friend and colleague Mr. TONKO and I agree on many things, and we have a history of having worked together to hold the EPA to common-sense rules, and I appreciate that, but I need to clarify just a couple of quick things that my colleague mentioned.

From the Environmental Council of the States, I have before me a letter that I would like to enter into the RECORD stating that the Environmental Council of the States is writing to support many of the concepts included in this legislation, on all three pieces of this legislation.

And the other organization, the Association of State and Territorial Solid Waste Management Officials, they don't take positions on legislation; so no matter what the piece of legislation would be, if you call them, they are not going to take a position on it one way or another. That does not mean that they do not support this, but they simply don't take positions.

I wanted to make those clarifications for the RECORD.

I reserve the balance of my time.

ECOS, THE ENVIRONMENTAL

COUNCIL OF THE STATES,

Washington, DC, June 18, 2013.

Re "CERCLA Bills" H.R.s 2226, 2318, 2279

Hon. FRED UPTON,

Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. HENRY WAXMAN,

Ranking Member, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN: The Environmental Council of the States (ECOS) is writing to support many of the concepts included in H.R. 2226 The Federal and State Partnership for Environmental Protection Act of 2013, H.R. 2318 The Federal Facility Accountability Act of 2013 H.R. 2279, and The Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations Act of 2013.

As stated in our testimony at your hearing on May 17, ECOS supports the expansion of "consultation with states" as described in the bills. ECOS especially acknowledges that the bills directly address concerns expressed by the States in our ECOS Resolution on federal facilities operations under RCRA and CERCLA (attached; see especially the bolded items).

ECOS is a non-partisan, non-profit organization of the state environmental agencies and their leaders, who are our members.

We ask that you include this letter in the record on this matter. If there is anything else that ECOS can do to assist you in this matter, please do not hesitate to ask.

Regards,

R. STEVEN BROWN,

Executive Director.

Attachment.

ON ENVIRONMENTAL FEDERALISM

Whereas, the states are co-regulators with the federal government in a federal system; and

Whereas, the meaningful and substantial involvement of the state environmental agencies as partners with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) is critical to both the development and implementation of environmental programs; and

Whereas, the U.S. Congress has provided by statute for delegation, authorization, or primacy (hereinafter referred to collectively as "delegation") of certain federal program responsibilities to states which, among other things, enables states to establish state programs that go beyond the minimum federal program requirements; and

Whereas, States that have received delegation have demonstrated to the U.S. EPA that they have the independent authority to adopt and they have adopted laws, regulations, and policies at least as stringent as federal laws, regulations, and policies; and

Whereas, states have further demonstrated their commitment to environmental protection by taking responsibility for 96% of the primary environmental programs which can be delegated to states; and

Whereas, because of this delegation, the state environmental agencies have a unique position as co-regulators and co-funders of these programs; and

Whereas, the delegation of new federal environmental rules (issued as final and completed actions and published by the U.S. EPA) to the states to implement continues at a steady pace of about 28 per year since spring 2007, for a total of approximately 143 new final rules and completed actions to implement through fall 2011; and

Whereas, federal financial support to implement environmental programs delegated to the states has declined since 2005; and

Whereas, cuts in federal and state support adversely affects the states' ability to implement federal programs in a timely manner and to adequately protect human health and the environment; and

Whereas, states currently perform the vast majority of environmental protection tasks in America, including 96% of the enforcement and compliance actions; and collection of more than 94% of the environmental quality data currently held by the U.S. EPA; and

Whereas, these accomplishments represent a success by the U.S. EPA and the states working together in ways the U.S. Congress originally envisioned to move environmental responsibility to the states, not an indictment of the U.S. EPA's performance; and

Whereas, the U.S. EPA provides great value in achieving protection of human health and the environment by fulfilling numerous important functions, including; establishing minimum national standards; ensuring state-to-state consistency in the implementation of those national standards; supporting research and providing information; and providing standardized pollution control activities across jurisdictions; and

Whereas, with respect to program operation, when a program has been delegated to a state and the state is meeting the minimum delegated program requirements, the role of the U.S. EPA is oversight and funding support rather than state-level implementation of programs; and

Whereas, under some federal programs the U.S. EPA grants to states the flexibility to adjust one-size-fits-all programs to local conditions and to try new procedures and techniques to accomplish agreed-upon environmental program requirements, thereby assuring an effective and efficient expenditure of the taxpayers' money. Now, therefore, be it resolved that the environmental

Council of the States: Affirms its continuing support for the protection of human health and the environment by providing for clean air, clean water, and proper handling of waste materials;

Affirms that states are co-regulators, co-funders and partners with appropriate federal agencies, including the U.S. EPA, and with each other in a federal environmental protection system;

Affirms the need for adequate funding for both state environmental programs and the U.S. EPA, given the vitally important role of both levels of government;

Affirms that expansion of environmental authority to the states is to be supported, while preemption of state authority, including preemption that limits the state's ability to establish environmental programs more stringent than federal programs, is to be opposed;

Supports the authorization or delegation of programs to the states and believes that when a program has been authorized or delegated, the appropriate federal focus should be on program reviews, and, further, believes that the federal government should intervene in such state programs where required by court order or where a state fails to enforce federal rules particularly involving spillovers of harm from one state to another;

Supports early, meaningful, and substantial state involvement in the development and implementation of environmental statutes, policies, rules, programs, reviews, joint priority setting, budget proposals, budget processes, and strategic planning, and calls upon the U.S. Congress and appropriate federal agencies to provide expanded opportunities for such involvement;

Specifically calls on U.S. EPA to consult in a meaningful, timely, and concurrent manner with the states' environmental agencies in the priority setting, planning, and budgeting of offices of the U.S. EPA as these offices conduct these efforts;

Further specifically calls on U.S. EPA to consult in a meaningful and timely manner with the states' environmental agencies regarding the U.S. EPA interpretation of federal regulations, and to ensure that the U.S. EPA has fully articulated its interpretation of federal regulations prior to the U.S. EPA intervention in state programs;

Believes that such integrated consultation will increase mutual understanding, improve state-federal relations, remove barriers, reduce costs, and more quickly improve the nation's environmental quality;

Noting the extensive contributions states have made to a clean environment, affirms its belief that where the federal government requires that environmental actions be taken, the federal government ought to fund those actions, and not at the expense of other state programs;

Affirms that the federal government should be subject to the same environmental rules and requirements, including the susceptibility to enforcement that it imposes on states and other parties;

Affirms its support for the concept of flexibility and that the function of the federal environmental agency is, working with the states, largely to set goals for environmental accomplishment and that, to the maximum extent possible, the means of achieving those goals should be left primarily to the states; especially as relates to the use of different methods to implement core programs, such as risk-based inspections or multi-media environmental programs, and particularly in the development of new programs which will impact both states and the U.S. EPA; and

Directs ECOS staff to provide a copy of this resolution to the U.S. EPA Administrator.

CLARIFICATION OF CERCLA SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY WAIVER FOR FEDERAL FACILITIES

Whereas, current and former federal facilities have some of the most pressing environmental problems, such as hazardous substances, unexploded ordnance, radioactive materials, and abandoned mines; and

Whereas, problems associated with some of these federal facilities pose substantial threats to public health, safety, and the environment; and

Whereas, ECOS believes the States' regulatory role at federal facilities should be recognized and that federal agency environmental cleanup activities are subject to and should receive the same regulatory oversight as private entities; and

Whereas, for many contamination actions the federal agencies assert Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) lead agency authority under Executive Order 12580; and

Whereas, state experience for many contamination actions has shown that assertions of sovereign immunity and CERCLA lead agency authority have led to inappropriate and/or inconsistent interpretation of state law and have not supported cleanup to the same standards as private parties; and

Whereas, assertions of sovereign immunity and CERCLA lead agency authority hamper consistent state regulatory oversight and responsibility to its citizens; and

Whereas, a clarification of Executive Order 12580 and/or federal legislation would aid states in implementing regulations which have been duly enacted by the states; and

Whereas, this resolution fully supports Policy NR-03i (specifically Section 3.5 on "Natural Resources") executed by the National Governors' Association. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved that the environmental Council of the States (ECOS):

Requests the Administration revise Executive Order 12580 to clarify that federal facilities are subject to appropriate state regulations and are not unduly shielded by sovereign immunity and lead agency authority;

Encourages the U.S. Congress act to support the States by the implementation of specific legislation which will without equivocation acknowledge state authority and regulatory responsibility for oversight of removal and cleanup actions at current and formerly owned or operated federal facilities; and

Authorizes the transmittal of this resolution to the Administration, appropriate congressional committees, federal agencies, and other interested organizations and individuals.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, while the Environmental Council of the States may have supported some concepts of the bill, they have not moved to endorse the bill. I will stand by my statement.

Next I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a staunch defender of the environment and a good friend.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy and leadership here on the floor.

When I first heard that we were going to be dealing with Superfund reforms and modifications, I was originally encouraged. I have been working with these issues on the Federal level, and before that, for almost 20 years, as a local official dealing with the problems of pollution in Superfund sites. I know that there are many challenges to the

process and that it is chronically and dramatically underfunded. It is complex and cumbersome. Many of the participants are not fully equipped to be able to manage it. We have learned a little bit in the almost 30 years since the legislation was passed, but I am sad to say I was very disappointed because, rather than dealing in a thoughtful, bipartisan way to try and refine the process, we are actually taking a step backward.

This bill would water down the requirements and provide fewer dollars, blurring lines of responsibility. This is not going to help. The Superfund tax expired in 1995. Since then, we have been shifting the burden away from the petrochemical industry that created these problems in the main, shifting it to the general fund taxpayer, a scarce and dwindling supply.

This isn't going to move away from litigation; it is going to make it more likely, if it were enacted, by confusing people. Changing the rules that people have operated under is not going to be helpful; it is going to slow it down further.

I am deeply concerned that the Department of Defense has not fully met its obligation as the largest generator of Superfund sites in the United States. I have been on this floor repeatedly attempting to work through the budget process and the authorization process for us to step up and do right by people.

I have got a harbor that was the staging area for three wars, and a significant amount of the pollution there that we are dealing with is as a result of that Defense Department operation. But what we are doing here would, according to the Department of Defense, disrupt the national priority scheme in which the most contaminated Federal sites are cleaned up first. It would increase litigation, delay cleanup, and waste already limited resources.

Now, by pretending that somehow the State government is going to take the lead and compel Federal agencies to do things that may in fact be contrary to Federal law is not going to speed this process further. It is not going to make it easier. It is going to continue what is the problem. People today dig in their heels.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TONKO. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. We haven't actually moved forward to try to work carefully, to thoughtfully, in a bipartisan session, refine it. We are going ahead and trying to superimpose on top of it things that will undercut that effort.

Now, I am critical of what the Federal Government has done in some areas, but as a practical matter, local governments, by failure to zone, plan, regulate, and exercise oversight, have often been responsible for many of these problems. And they have, in the main, not stepped up and been aggressive

with the strictest of standards. This would superimpose what are potentially less rigorous or, in fact, no local standards, be able to cost shift to the Federal Government without any interest in providing the resources for the Federal Government to do so.

I would hope that our friends, if they are sincere, would spend time with people who are in the trenches and look for ways in a bipartisan, thoughtful way to refine the Superfund program so that, in the spirit of what originally created the legislation, we can do something that will do better by our constituents, better by the environment, and better by the taxpayer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) who has organized the Environmental Justice Advocates of his home State of Minnesota, and is also the chair of the Progressive Caucus in the House.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, the polluter pays. The polluter pays, and that is a simple idea with very broad appeal. The company responsible for causing the pollution should have to pay for the cleanup. It makes sense. This bill would relieve many companies of that responsibility when it comes to the most polluted sites in the country. Instead, taxpayers will pick up the tab. It is another bailout.

Currently, if a company is part of an industry with a record of pollution, it needs to post a bond or buy insurance. This requirement helps to prevent a company from polluting until it goes out of business, leaving the taxpayer with the bill for the cleanup.

H.R. 2279 allows the company to skirt its financial responsibility, in essence, to internalize all the money they make while polluting but to externalize all of the costs after they are done and leaving everyone else to shoulder the burden. That is not free market enterprise; that is crony capitalism.

The bill would also reduce funding for highly contaminated sites. It should be increasing funding for the sites so their cleanup does not drag on for decades. Less funding is not the answer. Because funding is already so short for these Superfund sites, we have to prioritize the worst sites for cleanup, and the result is the National Priorities List. This bill would disrupt that priority system.

Mr. Chairman, instead of letting polluters off the hook, we should use the money to put people to work by cleaning up the long list of toxic sites all over the country that are exposing people to toxic waste, pushing down property values, and inhibiting economic growth.

As I close, I just want to say that this bill, like so many bills offered by the majority, rests upon a falsehood, and that is that health and safety regulations hurt the economy. They don't. It is not true. It is a false statement, and there is no evidence for them to

prove that it is true. And yet they want us to believe, as these companies deregulate and get tax cuts and all these other benefits, that they are going to use the extra money they get in order to create jobs, which they never do.

Reject this bill. It is a bad idea.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. Chair, H.R. 2279 is a deeply flawed bill that will increase costs, increase litigation, slow down the pace of cleanups, and, indeed, put the public at risk. It will do nothing to make cleanups at contaminated sites more efficient or more effective.

The proponent's intended goals for this legislation are not reflected in the bill's language. We can, and we should, do much better for people living in communities that are dealing with toxic legacies from past failures to deal with hazardous substances properly.

If we want to prevent new Superfund sites from being created and to clean up contaminated sites in their communities and convert them from liabilities to productive assets, we must reject H.R. 2279. I oppose this legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same.

With that, Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, I want to go back and revisit just briefly some of the cost implications or the allegations of cost implications of today's legislation that we are considering.

CBO carefully analyzed all three of the bills that we are considering as part of H.R. 2279 today, and here is what they said:

CBO estimates that, in some cases, implementing this legislation could affect the pace of discretionary spending if priorities for cleanup activities change. However, CBO expects that total costs to fulfill Federal responsibilities under CERCLA would be little changed under this legislation.

That was directly from the CBO score for H.R. 2226.

Based on information from EPA, CBO expects that removing the current requirement to review certain recommendations every 3 years would reduce administrative costs. However, some of those savings in administrative expenses would be offset by spending on the new requirement to report to the Congress any financial responsibility requirements. CBO estimates that, on balance, implementing this legislation would not have a significant net impact on spending that is subject to appropriation over the 2014-2018 period. Enacting H.R. 2279 would not affect direct spending or revenues.

That was directly from the CBO score for H.R. 2279.

CBO estimates that enacting this legislation could increase the pace of discretionary spending to the extent that Federal agencies accelerate spending

related to cleanup activities or pay additional fines and penalties imposed by the States. However, CBO expects that aggregate, long-term costs to fulfill Federal responsibilities under CERCLA would be little changed under the legislation.

In addition, H.R. 2318 could increase direct spending to the extent that fines and penalties were paid from the Treasury's Judgment Fund. However, CBO expects that any incremental spending from that fund would probably be insignificant. CBO estimates that any additional direct spending over the 2014–2023 period would be insignificant.

CBO goes on to say:

Enacting this legislation would not fundamentally change the Federal Government's responsibility to comply with CERCLA. According to the latest financial report of the United States, the Federal Government's current environmental remediation and waste disposal liabilities exceed \$300 billion (under all environmental laws). Under current law, Federal agencies, in particular the Departments of Defense and Energy, currently spend billions of dollars each year conducting cleanup activities under CERCLA, including reimbursements to State agencies for related services they provide. Based on information from Federal agencies and industry representatives, CBO expects that enacting this legislation could induce Federal agencies to accelerate their compliance activities at some facilities—possibly changing the timing of funding requests for certain projects. As a result, H.R. 2318 might lead to greater compliance costs for Federal facilities for the years immediately following enactment, but the total long-term cost of compliance would not change substantially.

I just wanted to make that point for the record.

Finally, I want to urge my colleagues not to be misled by my colleague's argument that this bill somehow prevents the EPA from enacting financial assurance requirements. It simply does not. More than 30 years passed before EPA complied with the requirements of CERCLA and started the process of developing financial assurance requirements. All this bill does is require the EPA to acknowledge the body of law developed by the States and other Federal agencies in the more than 30 years since the EPA has failed to act.

This legislation does not limit EPA from establishing Federal CERCLA financial responsibility requirements or from setting a minimum level of financial assurance that is required. H.R. 2279 merely ensures that existing State and Federal requirements can be used to meet those requirements where appropriate and ensures that existing State protections that may already exceed a new Federal minimum requirement will not be automatically voided.

The purpose of the provision in the bill requiring the EPA to report to Congress before new CERCLA financial responsibility requirements are enacted is to make sure that there is a legitimate need for new requirements. It does not prevent the EPA from promulgating new requirements if they are necessary.

My colleague argues that the bill is based on a false premise that States are implementing adequate financial assurance requirements. The bill does not prejudice State financial assurance requirements. What the bill does is require the EPA to analyze the existing financial assurance requirements, and it directs the EPA to “fill the gap” left by financial assurance regulations developed by the States or other Federal agencies. But make no mistake, if there is a regulatory gap and the EPA believes that gap needs to be filled, the EPA is free to enact regulations.

The purpose of financial assurance under 108(b) of CERCLA was to prevent the creation of new Superfund sites. The bill provides a mechanism for gathering information to decide whether the existing State and Federal financial assurance requirements are adequate to protect the Federal Government from incurring response costs under CERCLA.

The bill directs the EPA to gather information and report back to us before it promulgates any additional requirements. It does not otherwise preclude the EPA from enacting rules that the EPA determines are necessary. In fact, we understand that the EPA has already been gathering this information from the States and other Federal agencies like the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service.

The bill simply sets out a process for us to learn what State and other agency requirements are out there and whether there is a need for more regulation before the EPA creates yet another layer of regulation. Contrary to what my colleagues are saying, the bill does not cut off any rulemaking by the EPA.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee print 113–30. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 2279

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—REDUCING EXCESSIVE DEADLINE OBLIGATIONS

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations Act of 2013”.

SEC. 102. REVIEW OF REGULATIONS UNDER THE SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL ACT.

Section 2002(b) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6912(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) REVIEW OF REGULATIONS.—The Administrator shall review, and revise, as the Administrator determines appropriate, regulations promulgated under this Act.”.

SEC. 103. FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR CLASSES OF FACILITIES UNDER CERCLA.

Section 108(b) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9608(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “Not later than three years after the date of enactment of the Act, the President shall” and inserting “The President shall, as appropriate,”; and

(B) by striking “first” after “for which requirements will be”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “Financial responsibility may be established” and inserting “Owners and operators may establish financial responsibility”;

(B) by striking “any one, or any combination, of the following;” and inserting “forms of security, including”; and

(C) by striking “or qualification” and inserting “and qualification”.

SEC. 104. REPORT TO CONGRESS REGARDING FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.

Section 108(b) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9608(b)) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) The President may not promulgate any financial responsibility requirement under this subsection without first submitting to Congress a report—

“(A) describing each facility or class of facilities to be covered by such requirement;

“(B) describing the development of such requirement, why the facility or class of facilities proposed to be covered by such requirement present the highest level of risk of injury, and why the facility or class of facilities is not already covered by adequate financial responsibility requirements;

“(C) describing the financial responsibility requirements promulgated by States or other Federal agencies for the facility or class of facilities to be covered by the financial responsibility requirement proposed under this subsection and explaining why the requirement proposed under this subsection is necessary;

“(D) describing the exposure to the Fund for response costs resulting from the facility or class of facilities proposed to be covered; and

“(E) describing the capacity of the financial and credit markets to provide instruments of financial responsibility necessary to meet such requirement.

The President shall update any report submitted under this paragraph to reflect any revision of the facilities or classes of facilities to be covered by a financial responsibility requirement that is the subject of such report.”.

SEC. 105. PREEMPTION OF FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.

Section 114(d) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9614(d)) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) No owner or operator of a vessel or facility who establishes and maintains evidence of financial responsibility associated with the production, transportation, treatment, storage, or disposal of hazardous substances pursuant to financial responsibility requirements under any State law or regulation, or any other Federal law or regulation, shall be required to establish or maintain evidence of financial responsibility under this title, unless the President determines, after notice and opportunity for public comment, that in the event of a release of a hazardous substance that is not a federally permitted release or authorized by a State permit, such other Federal or State financial responsibility requirements are insufficient to cover likely response costs under section 104. If the President determines that such other Federal or State

financial responsibility requirements are insufficient to cover likely response costs under section 104 in the event of such a release, the President shall accept evidence of compliance with such other Federal or State financial responsibility requirements in lieu of compliance with any portion of the financial responsibility requirements promulgated under this title to which they correspond.”.

SEC. 106. EXPLOSIVE RISKS PLANNING NOTIFICATION.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the owner or operator of each facility at which substances listed in appendix A to part 27 of title 6, Code of Federal Regulations, as flammables or explosives are present above the screening threshold listed therein shall notify the State emergency response commission for the State in which such facility is located that such substances are present at such facility and of the amount of such substances that are present at such facility.

TITLE II—FEDERAL AND STATE PARTNERSHIP FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Federal and State Partnership for Environmental Protection Act of 2013”.

SEC. 202. CONSULTATION WITH STATES.

(a) REMOVAL.—Section 104(a)(2) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(a)(2)) is amended by striking “Any removal action undertaken by the President under this subsection (or by any other person referred to in section 122) should” and inserting “In undertaking a removal action under this subsection, the President (or any other person undertaking a removal action pursuant to section 122) shall consult with the affected State or States. Such removal action should”.

(b) REMEDIAL ACTION.—Section 104(c)(2) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(c)(2)) is amended by striking “before determining any appropriate remedial action” and inserting “during the process of selecting, and in selecting, any appropriate remedial action”.

(c) SELECTION OF REMEDIAL ACTION.—Section 104(c)(4) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(c)(4)) is amended by striking “shall select remedial actions” and inserting “shall, in consultation with the affected State or States, select remedial actions”.

(d) CONSULTATION WITH STATE AND LOCAL OFFICIALS.—Section 120(f) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620(f)) is amended—

(1) by striking “shall afford to” and inserting “shall consult with”;

(2) by inserting “and shall provide such State and local officials” before “the opportunity to participate in”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following: “If State or local officials make a determination not to participate in the planning and selection of the remedial action, such determination shall be documented in the administrative record regarding the selection of the response action.”.

SEC. 203. STATE CREDIT FOR OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS.

Section 104(c)(5) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(c)(5)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by inserting “removal at such facility, or for” before “remedial action”; and

(B) by striking “non-Federal funds.” and inserting “non-Federal funds, including oversight costs and in-kind expenditures. For purposes of this paragraph, in-kind expenditures shall in-

clude expenditures for, or contributions of, real property, equipment, goods, and services, valued at a fair market value, that are provided for the removal or remedial action at the facility, and amounts derived from materials recycled, recovered, or reclaimed from the facility, valued at a fair market value, that are used to fund or offset all or a portion of the cost of the removal or remedial action.”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “removal or” after “under this paragraph shall include expenses for”.

SEC. 204. STATE CONCURRENCE WITH LISTING ON THE NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST.

(a) BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION.—Section 105(a)(8)(B) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9605(a)(8)(B)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “Not later than 90 days after any revision of the national list, with respect to a priority not included on the revised national list, upon request of the State that submitted the priority for consideration under this subparagraph, the President shall provide to such State, in writing, the basis for not including such priority on such revised national list. The President may not add a facility to the national list over the written objection of the State, unless (i) the State, as an owner or operator or a significant contributor of hazardous substances to the facility, is a potentially responsible party, (ii) the President determines that the contamination has migrated across a State boundary, resulting in the need for response actions in multiple States, or (iii) the criteria under the national contingency plan for issuance of a health advisory have been met.” after “the President shall consider any priorities established by the States.”; and

(2) by striking “To the extent practicable, the highest priority facilities shall be designated individually and shall be referred to as” and all that follows through the semicolon at the end, and inserting “Not more frequently than once every 5 years, a State may designate a facility that meets the criteria set forth in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, which shall be included on the national list.”.

(b) STATE INVOLVEMENT.—Section 121(f)(1)(C) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9621(f)(1)(C)) is amended by striking “deleting sites from” and inserting “adding sites to, and deleting sites from.”.

SEC. 205. STATE ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANT LAW.

Section 121(d)(2)(A)(ii) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9621(d)(2)(A)(ii)) is amended by striking “State environmental or facility siting law” and inserting “State environmental, facility siting, or environmental covenant law, or under a State law or regulation requiring the use of engineering controls or land use controls.”.

TITLE III—FEDERAL FACILITY ACCOUNTABILITY

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Federal Facility Accountability Act of 2013”.

SEC. 302. FEDERAL FACILITIES.

(a) APPLICATION TO FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—Section 120(a) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620(a)) is amended in the heading by striking “OF ACT”.

(b) APPLICATION OF REQUIREMENTS TO FEDERAL FACILITIES.—Section 120(a)(2) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “preliminary assessments” and inserting “response actions”;

(2) by inserting “or” after “National Contingency Plan.”;

(3) by striking “, or applicable to remedial actions at such facilities”; and

(4) by inserting “or have been” before “owned or operated”.

(c) APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.—Section 120(a)(4) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620(a)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

“(4) APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each department, agency, and instrumentality of the United States shall be subject to, and comply with, at facilities that are or have been owned or operated by any such department, agency, or instrumentality, State substantive and procedural requirements regarding response relating to hazardous substances or pollutants or contaminants, including State hazardous waste requirements, in the same manner and to the same extent as any nongovernmental entity.

“(B) COMPLIANCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The United States hereby expressly waives any immunity otherwise applicable to the United States with respect to any State substantive or procedural requirement referred to in subparagraph (A).

“(ii) INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—Neither the United States, nor any agent, employee, nor officer thereof, shall be immune or exempt from any process or sanction of any State or Federal Court with respect to the enforcement of any injunctive relief under subparagraph (C)(ii).

“(iii) CIVIL PENALTIES.—No agent, employee, or officer of the United States shall be personally liable for any civil penalty under any State substantive or procedural requirement referred to in subparagraph (A), or this Act, with respect to any act or omission within the scope of the official duties of the agent, employee, or officer.

“(C) SUBSTANTIVE AND PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS.—The State substantive and procedural requirements referred to in subparagraph (A) include—

“(i) administrative orders;

“(ii) injunctive relief;

“(iii) civil and administrative penalties and fines, regardless of whether such penalties or fines are punitive or coercive in nature or are imposed for isolated, intermittent, or continuing violations;

“(iv) reasonable service charges or oversight costs; and

“(v) laws or regulations requiring the imposition and maintenance of engineering or land use controls.

“(D) REASONABLE SERVICE CHARGES OR OVERSIGHT COSTS.—The reasonable service charges or oversight costs referred to in subparagraph (C) include fees or charges assessed in connection with—

“(i) the processing, issuance, renewal, or modification of permits;

“(ii) the review of plans, reports, studies, and other documents;

“(iii) attorney’s fees;

“(iv) inspection and monitoring of facilities or vessels; and

“(v) any other nondiscriminatory charges that are assessed in connection with a State requirement regarding response relating to hazardous substances or pollutants or contaminants.”.

SEC. 303. AUTHORITY TO DELEGATE, ISSUE REGULATIONS.

Section 115 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9615) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “If the President delegates or assigns any duties or powers under this section to a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States other than the Administrator, the Administrator may review, as the Administrator determines necessary or upon request of any State, actions taken, or regulations promulgated, pursuant to such delegation or assignment, for purposes of ensuring consistency with the guidelines, rules, regulations, or criteria established by the Administrator under this title.”.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those

printed in part A of House Report 113–322. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. SINEMA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 113–322.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, strike lines 13 and 14 and insert the following: “U.S.C. 9605(a)(8)(B)) is amended by inserting “Not later than 90 days after”.

Page 9, line 7, strike “; and” and insert a period.

Page 9, strike lines 8 through 15.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 455, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment would strike language that expands eligibility for the National Priorities List in section 204, which is overseen by the Environmental Protection Agency.

My amendment also reinstates language that directs listings of the “highest priority facilities” for cleanup and guarantees that State-commended sites receive priority.

□ 1515

In 2003, an agreement was finalized to provide much-needed cleanup to the North Indian Bend Wash site in my district. The site, formerly used for industrial production and manufacturing, now spans several housing developments in which thousands of Arizona families, students and seniors reside.

Since then, Federal, State, and local stakeholders have worked together to put a 25-year plan in place to address soil and water contamination at this site, but those plans have not gone uninterrupted. In January of 2008, more than 3.5 million gallons of contaminated water were mistakenly delivered from this site to homes in Paradise Valley, and in July of that same year, irrigation water used from this site triggered a study at an elementary school in my district to determine if the school grounds had been contaminated.

The North Indian Bend Wash site is one of many sites across the country listed under the National Priorities List, which provides much-needed funding to assist States with cleanup efforts.

In keeping with the mission of the National Priorities List, which is to

protect public health, my amendment protects funding for important cleanup projects, like the North Indian Bend Wash, that are taking place in hundreds of communities across the country.

The underlying bill would expand eligibility for the National Priorities List, stretching its mission beyond its current financial means without providing additional funding to accommodate this expansion. My amendment prevents this unfunded expansion.

In times of financial shortfall, we should ensure that we efficiently and responsibly use taxpayers dollars to prioritize projects by need and maximize our impact on improving public health. While I agree that providing more robust State input is essential to crafting better environmental policy, H.R. 2279 would actually repeal language that requires the administration to prioritize the most urgent and impactful State projects for cleanup.

I also believe that striking the “highest priority facilities” language, as called for in the underlying bill, may have the unintended consequence of diminishing the statutory role that States would have in determining the EPA’s cleanup priorities. The underlying bill strikes the only clause in the current law that explicitly protects states’ rights with NPL. Without this language, it is possible that the underlying bill could result in the EPA’s placing certain projects that States have requested at the bottom of its funding priorities on the NPL while still following the law. My amendment reinstates this language, directing the EPA to make tough choices that necessarily respect the interests of our States.

We all share the desire to work towards commonsense, reasonable solutions, using tax dollars wisely, facilitating job growth and improving public health. This amendment provides a meaningful fix to the underlying bill by preventing an unfunded expansion of the NPL and directing the administration to make tough choices that respect the rights of States. I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes the provision that would allow States to list a site on the National Priorities List once every 5 years.

States have a great deal of experience and expertise in cleaning up sites contaminated by hazardous wastes, and States are often in a better position to understand the realities of site cleanup in their States and to understand the local or regional issues affecting the cleanup, but there are times when it would be better addressed by the EPA

under CERCLA, and there would be a significant delay in the listing process. As a result, the bill also allows a State to designate a site that meets the criteria for listing to the National Priorities List once every 5 years.

CERCLA currently permits States to list a site on the National Priorities List only once. States have taken to calling this their “silver bullet.” Using the silver bullet fast-tracks the listing of a site on the NPL and allows States to avoid the often lengthy listing process. Some States have already used their silver bullet, while others hold onto it and wait for a site that it believes would be better addressed by the EPA under CERCLA.

My colleague indicated in a Dear Colleague letter she circulated earlier today that the bill could result in the EPA’s placing silver bullet projects at the bottom of the priorities list while still remaining in statutory compliance. While I appreciate my colleague’s concern, this statement is both misleading and incorrect. The reality is that the EPA can place a silver bullet site—or any other site for that matter—at the bottom of its priority list at any time. This bill does not change the EPA’s ability to prioritize sites for cleanup.

CERCLA is very process heavy, and States are often reluctant to wade into the drawn-out CERCLA process. They would rather clean up the sites themselves and avoid the stigma associated with having a Superfund site in their States. However, there are times when the only way to get a site cleaned up is to get it on the Superfund list. It is not an easy conclusion for States to come to, and States are not clamoring to list on the National Priorities List. So any argument that this bill would somehow result in an onslaught of new listings by the States would simply not play out.

One of the arguments against allowing States to list a site on the NPL is that it will somehow change the EPA’s prioritization of how to spend its cleanup dollars. Just because a site is listed on the NPL does not mean that it will automatically receive funding or will somehow jump to the front of the line to receive cleanup dollars. Nothing in this bill changes the fact that the EPA sets the priority for sites to be cleaned up, and the EPA decides how to spend its cleanup dollars.

Furthermore, if a site is listed and is being cleaned up using Federal dollars, States are financially invested in making sure the cleanup is done right. States must contribute 10 percent of the overall remedial cost and all of the long-term operation and maintenance costs. With that, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY), my colleague.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my colleague's amendment requiring the EPA to stay focused on the National Priorities List.

There are nine Superfund sites where I am from in the Hudson Valley of New York. Toxic sites once declared uninhabitable are now engines of economic development, and I want to credit the good folks at the EPA, including my friend Judith Enck, who leads Region 2, but one Hudson Valley community with poison in its water has waited over 10 years for a solution.

The EPA began cleanup at the site in Hopewell Junction in 2003 and officially added Hopewell to the Superfund National Priorities List in 2005. Hopewell Junction isn't some abandoned wasteland, and it isn't an empty brownfield. It is a community full of children and families who need our help and who need our help now. Hopewell could be a neighborhood anywhere, a neighborhood in which families shouldn't have to choose between clean water and their children's health, between selling their houses or staying in a place where they grew up and loved but is now contaminated. My neighbors, like Debra Hall, have put blood, sweat and tears into this effort for 10 years to try to clean up Hopewell—10 years telling anyone who would listen that Hopewell must be a priority because they can't wait.

It is outrageous, and they deserve better from their government. I support this amendment to keep our priorities straight, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I share the desire of my Republican colleagues to increase the input provided by and the role of States in listing facilities on the National Priorities List, but by adding more sites to an already overwhelmed program, we may diminish the effectiveness of this important program.

I am also concerned that the underlying bill, by striking the current statutory language that directs the EPA to give State-recommended sites priority, could have the unintended consequence of decreasing the role of States in this process. For these reasons, Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, ironically, the EPA often pushes States to identify more sites that the EPA can put on the list so that the EPA can argue for more cleanup funding. The EPA incentivizes States to identify sites that meet the listing criteria by giving the States that identify sites more funds to do initial site assessments.

So the long and short of it is that the EPA wants more sites on the NPL, and the EPA wants the States to assist

with identifying NPL sites, but the EPA does not want to relinquish control over the actual selection of the appropriate sites. We are trying to help fix that. Again, I urge a "no" vote from my colleagues on the Sinema amendment.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. TONKO

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 113-322.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

TITLE IV—AVOIDING INCREASED LITIGATION AND DELAYS IN CLEANUPS

SEC. 401. AVOIDING INCREASED LITIGATION AND DELAYS IN CLEANUPS.

This Act shall not take effect if any provision thereof would increase the potential for litigation, reduce the amount of funds available for the cleanup of contaminated sites, or delay the implementation of any such cleanup.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 455, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, my amendment adds a savings clause to H.R. 2279 to avoid unintended consequences and detrimental impacts on current and future site cleanup efforts.

We certainly know that the actual provisions of the bill trump the intended goals of the legislation. If, as the supporters of this bill claim, it will not increase litigation, it will not increase costs or delay ongoing or future site cleanups, my amendment would have no effect. However, if the administration's analysis is correct—and I believe it is—my amendment will keep current site cleanups on track and ensure that taxpayer dollars are spent efficiently—spent on cleaning up contaminated sites and not spent in courtrooms.

If the committee had taken additional time to do the necessary oversight that would enable us to identify the best options for improving the Superfund program, my amendment would not be necessary, but the many problems with this bill that Democratic members of the committee have raised and that are echoed in the ad-

ministration's analysis make my amendment truly necessary.

As the administration's statement of policy points out, H.R. 2279 severely reduces the Federal Government's role in the cleanup of Federal sites. The Federal Government's ability to set a "worst first" prioritization agenda for site cleanups is eliminated. The Federal Government pays the vast majority of the costs for site cleanups on Federal lands and sites on the National Priorities List. The Federal Government certainly should consult with the State on sites within its borders, but especially in cases where Federal land, Federal tax dollars, Federal employees, and Federal operations are concerned, the Federal Government should have the last word.

My amendment provides a prudent insurance policy to ensure that we do not use limited Superfund resources to litigate rather than to mitigate. My amendment ensures that we move forward. It ensures that we clean up these sites and convert them from revenue liabilities to revenue enhancements. It ensures that we reduce public health risks from contamination. With that, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I am sure my colleague's amendment is well-intentioned, and in fact, I agree with him. I do not want to see an increase in litigation or a slowdown in the cleanup process or a decrease in funds available to clean up Superfund sites, but this amendment is not necessary because H.R. 2279 will not do any of those things.

CERCLA has been implemented for over 30 years, and the EPA has developed many practices and policies during that time. Some of the policies work and are consistently implemented, but many of the policies or practices are ineffective or are not consistently applied across the EPA regions. The EPA has done a good job of getting contaminated sites cleaned up under CERCLA, but that doesn't mean that we can't do better.

States are often in a better position to understand the local and regional issues affecting the cleanup, and States are well positioned to assist the EPA with all aspects of a response action. By ensuring that the States have a meaningful role in the Federal-State partnership under CERCLA and by making sure that Federal entities are on a level playing field with private entities engaged in CERCLA cleanups, we can do better and get more sites cleaned up faster.

My colleague's amendment implies that the purpose of this bill is to thwart cleanup efforts. On the contrary, the purpose of this legislation is to make sure sites get cleaned up in a

timely fashion by enhancing the existing role of the States, which are in the best position to assess the conditions at the site. The bill adjusts a top-down culture of CERCLA cleanups, but the bill does not alter the EPA's lead role in implementing CERCLA. States are already involved in the CERCLA process. Ensuring that States have a meaningful and substantial role will not slow down the cleanup process.

My colleague's amendment also implies that H.R. 2279 will reduce the number of funds available for cleanup. This is simply not the case. Congress decides on the amount of money to be appropriated to the EPA or to other Federal agencies for cleanups, and that is not changed by this legislation. It is up to the Federal agencies to prioritize how they spend the appropriated cleanup funds, and nothing in this bill changes the way money appropriated for cleanups is spent.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, our colleague and my friend from Ohio indicates that this bill will not increase litigation or increase costs or delay ongoing or future site cleanups, and so my amendment would not affect the measure before the House. So it really is a statement in support of the amendment. There is no just reason offered to not support the amendment.

With that, again, I would encourage my colleagues to support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, once again, I want to say how much I respect my colleague, Mr. TONKO. We continue to work together, have worked together, and have had some successes in holding the EPA accountable to the law. I appreciate working with him.

But this amendment, although well-intentioned, is drafted in such a way that makes it impossibly vague. It is indeterminable whether a provision of the bill would increase the potential for litigation, and I continue to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Tonko amendment.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part A of House Report 113-322 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Ms. SINEMA of Arizona.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. TONKO of New York.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. SINEMA

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 228, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

AYES—189

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge

Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsock
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng

Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters

Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOES—228

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Benishek
Bentivolio
Billirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foss
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger

Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Davis, Rodney
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri

Yarmuth
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—15

Barton
Cleaver
Crowley
Gabbard
Garamendi
Guthrie
Heck (NV)
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
Ruiz
Ruppersberger

□ 1559

Messrs. BOUSTANY, BROOKS of Alabama, WHITFIELD, HULTGREN, HUDSON, FLEISCHMANN, GOHMERT, LOBIONDO, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Messrs. TERRY and GALLEGO changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. LEE of California and Mr. SIREs changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 9, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. TONKO

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 227, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 8]

AYES—190

Andrews	Gallego	Michaud
Barber	Garcia	Miller, George
Barrow (GA)	Gibson	Moore
Bass	Grayson	Moran
Beatty	Green, Al	Murphy (FL)
Becerra	Green, Gene	Nadler
Bera (CA)	Grijalva	Napolitano
Bishop (GA)	Gutiérrez	Neal
Bishop (NY)	Hahn	Negrete McLeod
Blumenauer	Hanabusa	Nolan
Bonamici	Hastings (FL)	O'Rourke
Brady (PA)	Heck (WA)	Owens
Braley (IA)	Higgins	Pallone
Brown (FL)	Himes	Pascarell
Brownley (CA)	Hinojosa	Pastor (AZ)
Bustos	Holt	Payne
Butterfield	Honda	Pelosi
Capps	Horsford	Perlmutter
Capuano	Hoyer	Peters (CA)
Cárdenas	Huffman	Peters (MI)
Carney	Israel	Pingree (ME)
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Pocan
Cartwright	Jeffries	Polis
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Quigley
Chu	Kaptur	Rangel
Cicilline	Keating	Richmond
Clark (MA)	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Clarke (NY)	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)
Clay	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Clyburn	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Cohen	Kind	Schakowsky
Connolly	Kirkpatrick	Schiff
Conyers	Kuster	Schneider
Cooper	Langevin	Schrader
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Schwartz
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Cuellar	Lee (CA)	Scott, David
Cummings	Levin	Serrano
Davis (CA)	Lewis	Sewell (AL)
Davis, Danny	Lipinski	Shea-Porter
DeFazio	Loebach	Sherman
DeGette	Lofgren	Sinema
Delaney	Lowenthal	Sires
DeLauro	Lowey	Slaughter
DelBene	Lujan Grisham	Speier
Deutch	(NM)	Swalwell (CA)
Dingell	Luján, Ben Ray	Takano
Doggett	(NM)	Thompson (CA)
Doyle	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
Duckworth	Maffei	Tierney
Edwards	Maloney,	Titus
Ellison	Carolyn	Tonko
Engel	Maloney, Sean	Tsongas
Enyart	Matheson	Van Hollen
Eshoo	Matsui	Vargas
Esty	McCollum	Veasey
Farr	McDermott	Vela
Fattah	McGovern	Velázquez
Fitzpatrick	McIntyre	Visclosky
Foster	McNerney	Walz
Frankel (FL)	Meeks	Wasserman
Fudge	Meng	

SchultzWaters
Waxman

Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOES—227

Aderholt	Graves (MO)	Pittenger
Amash	Griffin (AR)	Pitts
Amodei	Griffith (VA)	Poe (TX)
Bachmann	Grimm	Pompeo
Bachus	Hall	Posey
Barletta	Hanna	Price (GA)
Barr	Harper	Radel
Benishek	Harris	Rahall
Bentivolio	Hartzler	Reed
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Reichert
Bishop (UT)	Hensarling	Renacci
Black	Herrera Beutler	Ribble
Blackburn	Holding	Rice (SC)
Boustany	Hudson	Rigell
Brady (TX)	Huelskamp	Roby
Bridenstine	Huizenga (MI)	Roe (TN)
Brooks (AL)	Hultgren	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (IN)	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Broun (GA)	Hurt	Rogers (MI)
Buchanan	Issa	Rohrabacher
Bucshon	Jenkins	Rokita
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Rooney
Byrne	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Jordan	Roskam
Camp	Joyce	Ross
Campbell	Kelly (PA)	Rothfus
Cantor	King (IA)	Royce
Capito	King (NY)	Runyan
Carter	Kingston	Ryan (WI)
Cassidy	Kinzinger (IL)	Salmon
Chabot	Kline	Sanford
Chaffetz	Labrador	Scalise
Coble	LaMalfa	Schock
Coffman	Lamborn	Schweikert
Cole	Lance	Scott, Austin
Collins (GA)	Lankford	Sensenbrenner
Collins (NY)	Latham	Sessions
Conaway	Latta	Shimkus
Cook	LoBiondo	Shuster
Cotton	Long	Simpson
Cramer	Lucas	Smith (MO)
Crawford	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NE)
Crenshaw	Lummis	Smith (NJ)
Culberson	Marchant	Smith (TX)
Daines	Marino	Southerland
Davis, Rodney	Massie	Stewart
Denham	McAllister	Stivers
Dent	McCarthy (CA)	Stockman
DeSantis	McCauley	Stutzman
DesJarlais	McHenry	Terry
Diaz-Balart	McKeon	Thompson (PA)
Duffy	McKinley	Thornberry
Duncan (SC)	McMorris	Tiberi
Duncan (TN)	Rodgers	Tipton
Elmiers	Meadows	Turner
Farenthold	Meehan	Upton
Fincher	Messer	Valadao
Fleischmann	Mica	Wagner
Fleming	Miller (FL)	Walberg
Florig	Miller (MI)	Walden
Forbes	Miller, Gary	Walorski
Fortenberry	Mullin	Weber (TX)
Fox	Mulvaney	Webster (FL)
Franks (AZ)	Murphy (PA)	Wenstrup
Frelinghuysen	Neugebauer	Westmoreland
Gardner	Noem	Whitfield
Garrett	Nugent	Williams
Gerlach	Nunes	Wilson (SC)
Gibbs	Nunnelee	Wittman
Gingrey (GA)	Olson	Wolf
Gohmert	Palazzo	Womack
Goodlatte	Paulsen	Woodall
Gosar	Pearce	Yoder
Gowdy	Perry	Yoho
Granger	Peterson	Young (AK)
Graves (GA)	Petri	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—15

Barton	Heck (NV)	Rush
Cleaver	Jones	Sánchez, Linda
Crowley	McCarthy (NY)	T.
Gabbard	McClintock	Smith (WA)
Garamendi	Ruiz	
Guthrie	Ruppersberger	

□ 1605

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. YODER, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2279) to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act relating to review of regulations under such Act and to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 relating to financial responsibility for classes of facilities, and, pursuant to House Resolution 455, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PETERS of California. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PETERS of California, moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2279 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

TITLE IV—PRESERVING THE POLLUTER PAYS PRINCIPLE AND LIMITING EXPOSURE TO TOXIC CHEMICALS

SEC. 401. PRESERVING THE POLLUTER PAYS PRINCIPLE AND LIMITING EXPOSURE TO TOXIC CHEMICALS.

This Act shall not take effect if any provision thereof would result in—

(1) fewer contaminated sites being cleaned up each year, or the responsibility for cleaning up a contaminated site being shifted from the polluter to the taxpayer; or

(2) greater long-term exposure for vulnerable populations, including populations in pre-schools, elementary and secondary schools, hospitals, and nursing homes within 5 miles of contaminated sites, to arsenic, mercury, cadmium, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), perchlorate, or other toxic substances that pollute drinking water or cause adverse human health effects, such as respiratory disease, cancer, or reproductive disorders.

Mr. PETERS of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will proceed immediately to final passage, as amended.

My amendment simply states that the bill won't take effect if it results in fewer cleaned-up sites, if it shifts responsibility from polluters to the American taxpayers, and if there is greater exposure to carcinogens for schools, hospitals, and nursing homes within 5 miles of a contaminated site.

Mr. Speaker, for too long, we have heard as an article of faith that we have to choose between a prosperous economy and a clean environment, the idea that we can't have both. That is a false choice.

People in San Diego and people around the country know that we deserve nothing less than both. We need to provide both economic opportunity and clean air and water for our future generations.

In my first career, for 15 years, I practiced environmental law in the public and private sectors. Many of my clients were businesses or local governments that struggled to understand and follow what they felt were overly complex and time-consuming regulatory requirements, and from this experience, I have no doubt that overly burdensome red tape hurts our economy.

So I hope that in any case where we can streamline and simplify environmental regulations, while still protecting and enhancing the health of our rivers, lakes, oceans, and air, that everyone in this Congress would be on-board.

I hope that we all agree that real substantive protections are important to ensuring that our drinking water, ocean water, and the land we live and farm on are safe for our children, the elderly, and our families. These resources are economic assets that we have inherited, that we have a responsibility to preserve, and that we must be active stewards in protecting.

At the heart of the Superfund program is the commonsense idea that those who caused pollution would pay to clean it up. The underlying bill turns away from this basic principle and, instead, puts hardworking taxpayers who didn't cause the pollution on the hook for the expensive cleanups. That is not right, and it is not a good incentive for preventing future contamination.

The bill creates an unfunded mandate by allowing States to move polluted sites off of their regulatory plates to the Federal Superfund list, shifting responsibility from corporations and States to the Federal taxpayer, and just as the Congress has slashed the Superfund budget 40 percent over the last 5 years. If we add more sites to the already burdened Federal list, we will

certainly delay cleanups at the expense of human health and the environment.

Second, the bill, for the first time ever, would subject our Federal employees to unfair penalties and perhaps even imprisonment if, in the good faith execution of their duties, they find that they can't comply with a State order because it directly conflicts with Federal law. Putting Federal workers who are tasked with cleaning up these heavily polluted sites in this position is beyond bad management, it is cruelly unfair, and it effectively scares employees from doing the very job we pay them, as taxpayers, to do.

Finally, the Department of Defense has serious concerns with the bill, as it would make it difficult to clean up many of the nearly 10,000 Superfund sites on military bases. According to the military, the bill would waste money on unnecessary litigation instead of actual site cleanup.

Just north of my district in San Diego, a part of Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton is a Superfund site. Nine areas of soil and groundwater have been contaminated by pesticides, metals, herbicides, and more. These waters sources flow into the neighboring Pacific Ocean, and every day that we delay the cleanup and restoration of this site, our servicemembers, civilians working on the site, and numerous endangered species in the region face adverse risks. We cannot let this continue.

In these lean fiscal times, we must make the most of limited Federal resources and taxpayer dollars. This legislation would bring with it unnecessary litigation, more spending that doesn't go to fixing the problems, exactly the kind of waste we are trying to eliminate from the Federal budget.

My motion to recommit ensures that we are both careful stewards of the taxpayer dime and the environment. We must support laws that protect human health and the environment and continue to enforce the idea that polluters—not hardworking taxpayers—pay for what they pollute.

I call on my colleagues not to fall for the false choice between growing the economy and protecting the environment. We can and we must do both. Vote “yes” on this motion, and stand with me to protect the taxpayer, protect children's health, and ensure that those who cause pollution pay to clean it up.

Mr. Speaker. I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1615

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the motion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, our goal with this legislation is clear and straightforward. We want to modernize outdated environmental laws. The part of the bill that the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) wrote

makes modest, but important, improvements in environmental law. It allows the EPA to review and revise its solid waste disposal regulations as necessary.

In a hearing that we had, we asked a mayor from New Jersey, Would you rather clean up the trash or revise regulations? The mayor made it clear he would rather focus on getting the real work done instead of getting bogged down in governmental red tape.

The part of the bill written by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) says that Federal facilities should behave like anyone else in the State and meet the same natural resource protection requirements. Now, go figure: requiring the Federal Government to live under the same laws that the American people, the States and private-sector businesses have to live under. This is not a new concept. It is already the case under the Clean Air Act and RCRA. Let's just narrow the gap for the Superfund.

Finally, the portion that I wrote ensures that States have a place at the discussion table throughout the process that the EPA set for developing remediation plans.

I urge a “no” vote on the motion to recommit and a “yes” on final passage. With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill, if ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 225, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 9]

AYES—188

Andrews	Cartwright	DeLauro
Barber	Castor (FL)	DelBene
Barrow (GA)	Castro (TX)	Deutch
Bass	Chu	Dingell
Beatty	Cielline	Doggett
Becerra	Clark (MA)	Doyle
Bera (CA)	Clarke (NY)	Duckworth
Bishop (GA)	Clay	Edwards
Bishop (NY)	Clyburn	Ellison
Blumenauer	Cohen	Engel
Bonamici	Connolly	Enyart
Brady (PA)	Conyers	Eshoo
Braley (IA)	Cooper	Esty
Brown (FL)	Costa	Farr
Brownley (CA)	Courtney	Fattah
Bustos	Cuellar	Foster
Butterfield	Cummings	Frankel (FL)
Capps	Davis (CA)	Fudge
Capuano	Davis, Danny	Gallego
Cárdenas	DeFazio	Garcia
Carney	DeGette	Grayson
Carson (IN)	Delaney	Green, Al

Green, Gene	Lynch	Roybal-Allard	Renacci	Schock	Valadao	Marchant	Pompeo	Simpson
Grijalva	Maffei	Ryan (OH)	Ribble	Schweikert	Wagner	Marino	Posey	Smith (MO)
Hahn	Maloney,	Sanchez, Loretta	Rice (SC)	Scott, Austin	Walberg	Massie	Price (GA)	Smith (NE)
Hanabusa	Carolyn	Sarbanes	Rigell	Sensenbrenner	Walden	McAllister	Radel	Smith (TX)
Hastings (FL)	Maloney, Sean	Schakowsky	Roby	Sessions	Walorski	McCarthy (CA)	Rahall	Southerland
Heck (WA)	Matheson	Schiff	Roe (TN)	Shimkus	Weber (TX)	McCaul	Reed	Stewart
Higgins	Matsui	Schneider	Rogers (AL)	Shuster	Webster (FL)	McHenry	Reichert	Stivers
Himes	McCollum	Schrader	Rogers (KY)	Simpson	Wenstrup	McIntyre	Renacci	Stutzman
Hinojosa	McDermott	Schwartz	Rogers (MI)	Smith (MO)	Westmoreland	McKeon	Ribble	Terry
Holt	McGovern	Scott (VA)	Rohrabacher	Smith (NE)	Whitfield	McKinley	Rice (SC)	Thompson (PA)
Honda	McIntyre	Scott, David	Rokita	Smith (NJ)	Williams	McMorris	Rigell	Thornberry
Horsford	McNerney	Serrano	Rooney	Smith (TX)	Wilson (SC)	Rodgers	Roby	Tiberi
Hoyer	Meeks	Sewell (AL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Southerland	Wittman	Meadows	Roe (TN)	Tipton
Huffman	Meng	Shea-Porter	Roskam	Stewart	Wolf	Meehan	Rogers (AL)	Turner
Israel	Michaud	Sherman	Ross	Stivers	Womack	Messer	Rogers (KY)	Upton
Jackson Lee	Miller, George	Sires	Rothfus	Stutzman	Woodall	Mica	Rogers (MI)	Valadao
Jeffries	Moore	Slaughter	Royce	Thompson (PA)	Yoder	Miller (FL)	Rohrabacher	Wagner
Johnson (GA)	Moran	Speier	Runyan	Thornberry	Yoho	Miller (MI)	Rokita	Walberg
Johnson, E. B.	Murphy (FL)	Swalwell (CA)	Salmon	Tipton	Young (AK)	Miller, Gary	Rooney	Walden
Kaptur	Nadler	Takano	Sanford	Turner	Young (IN)	Mullin	Ros-Lehtinen	Walorski
Keating	Napolitano	Thompson (CA)	Scalise	Upton		Mulvaney	Roskam	Walorski
Kelly (IL)	Neal	Thompson (MS)				Murphy (PA)	Ross	Weber (TX)
Kennedy	Negrete McLeod	Tierney				Neugebauer	Rothfus	Webster (FL)
Kildee	Nolan	Titus	Barton	Heck (NV)	Sánchez, Linda	Noem	Royce	Wenstrup
Kilmer	O'Rourke	Tonko	Cleaver	Jones	T.	Nugent	Runyan	Westmoreland
Kind	Owens	Tsongas	Crowley	McCarthy (NY)	Sinema	Nunes	Ryan (WI)	Whitfield
Kirkpatrick	Pallone	Van Hollen	Gabbard	McClintock	Smith (WA)	Nunnelee	Salmon	Williams
Kuster	Pascarell	Vargas	Garamendi	Ruiz	Stockman	Olson	Sanford	Wilson (SC)
Langevin	Pastor (AZ)	Veasey	Guthrie	Ruppersberger	Terry	Palazzo	Scalise	Wittman
Larsen (WA)	Payne	Vela	Gutiérrez	Rush		Paulsen	Schock	Wolf
Larson (CT)	Pelosi	Velázquez				Pearce	Schrader	Womack
Lee (CA)	Perlmutter	Visclosky				Perry	Schweikert	Woodall
Levin	Peters (CA)	Walz				Peterson	Scott, Austin	Yoder
Lewis	Peters (MI)	Wasserman				Petri	Sensenbrenner	Yoho
Lipinski	Peterson	Schultz				Pittenger	Sessions	Young (AK)
Loeback	Pingree (ME)	Waters				Pitts	Shimkus	Young (IN)
Lofgren	Pocan	Waxman				Poe (TX)	Shuster	
Lowenthal	Polis	Welch						
Lowey	Price (NC)	Wilson (FL)						
Lujan Grisham	Quigley	Yarmuth						
(NM)	Rangel							
Luján, Ben Ray	Richmond							
(NM)								

NOES—225

Aderholt	Ellmers	Kline
Amash	Farenthold	Labrador
Amodei	Fincher	LaMalfa
Bachmann	Fitzpatrick	Lamborn
Bachus	Fleischmann	Lance
Barletta	Fleming	Lankford
Barr	Flores	Latham
Benishek	Forbes	Latta
Bentivolio	Fortenberry	LoBiondo
Bilirakis	Fox	Long
Bishop (UT)	Franks (AZ)	Lucas
Black	Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer
Blackburn	Gardner	Lummis
Boustany	Garrett	Marchant
Brady (TX)	Gerlach	Marino
Bridenstine	Gibbs	Massie
Brooks (AL)	Gibson	McAllister
Brooks (IN)	Gingrey (GA)	McCarthy (CA)
Broun (GA)	Gohmert	McCaul
Buchanan	Goodlatte	McHenry
Bucshon	Gosar	McKeon
Burgess	Gowdy	McKinley
Byrne	Granger	McMorris
Calvert	Graves (GA)	Rodgers
Camp	Graves (MO)	
Campbell	Griffin (AR)	Meadows
Cantor	Griffith (VA)	Meehan
Capito	Grimm	Messer
Carter	Hall	Mica
Cassidy	Hanna	Miller (FL)
Chabot	Harper	Miller (MI)
Chaffetz	Harris	Miller, Gary
Coble	Hartzler	Mullin
Coffman	Hastings (WA)	Mulvaney
Cole	Hensarling	Murphy (PA)
Collins (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Neugebauer
Collins (NY)	Holding	Noem
Conaway	Hudson	Nugent
Cook	Huelskamp	Nunes
Cotton	Huizenga (MI)	Nunnelee
Cramer	Hultgren	Olson
Crawford	Hunter	Palazzo
Crenshaw	Hurt	Paulsen
Culberson	Issa	Pearce
Daines	Jenkins	Perry
Davis, Rodney	Johnson (OH)	Petri
Denham	Johnson, Sam	Pittenger
Dent	Jordan	Pitts
DeSantis	Joyce	Poe (TX)
DesJarlais	Kelly (PA)	Pompeo
Diaz-Balart	King (IA)	Posey
Duffy	King (NY)	Price (GA)
Duncan (SC)	Kingston	Radel
Duncan (TN)	Kinzinger (IL)	Reed
		Reichert

NOT VOTING—19

Heck (NV)	Sánchez, Linda
Jones	T.
McCarthy (NY)	Sinema
McClintock	Smith (WA)
Ruiz	Stockman
Ruppersberger	Terry
Rush	

□ 1623

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 225, noes 188, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]

AYES—225

Amash	Cotton	Grimm
Amodei	Cramer	Hall
Bachmann	Crawford	Hanna
Bachus	Crenshaw	Harper
Barletta	Culberson	Harris
Barr	Daines	Hartzler
Benishek	Davis, Rodney	Hastings (WA)
Bentivolio	Denham	Hensarling
Bilirakis	Dent	Herrera Beutler
Bishop (UT)	DeSantis	Holding
Black	DesJarlais	Hudson
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart	Huelskamp
Boustany	Duffy	Huizenga (MI)
Brady (TX)	Duncan (SC)	Hultgren
Bridenstine	Duncan (TN)	Hunter
Brooks (AL)	Ellmers	Hurt
Brooks (IN)	Farenthold	Issa
Broun (GA)	Fincher	Jenkins
Buchanan	Fleischmann	Johnson (OH)
Bucshon	Fleming	Johnson, Sam
Burgess	Flores	Jordan
Byrne	Forbes	Joyce
Calvert	Fortenberry	Kelly (PA)
Camp	Fox	King (IA)
Campbell	Franks (AZ)	King (NY)
Cantor	Frelinghuysen	Kingston
Capito	Gardner	Kinzinger (IL)
Carter	Garrett	Kline
Cassidy	Gerlach	Labrador
Chabot	Gibbs	LaMalfa
Chaffetz	Gohmert	Lamborn
Coble	Goodlatte	Lance
Coffman	Gosar	Lankford
Cole	Gowdy	Latham
Collins (GA)	Granger	Latta
Collins (NY)	Graves (GA)	Long
Conaway	Graves (MO)	Lucas
Cook	Griffin (AR)	Luetkemeyer
Costa	Griffith (VA)	Lummis

NOES—188

Andrews	Fudge	McGovern
Barber	Galleo	McNerney
Barrow (GA)	Garcia	Meeks
Bass	Gibson	Meng
Beatty	Grayson	Michaud
Becerra	Green, Al	Miller, George
Bera (CA)	Green, Gene	Moore
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Moran
Bishop (NY)	Gutiérrez	Murphy (FL)
Blumenauer	Hahn	Nadler
Bonamici	Hanabusa	Napolitano
Brady (PA)	Hastings (FL)	Neal
Braley (IA)	Heck (WA)	Negrete McLeod
Brown (FL)	Higgins	Nolan
Brownley (CA)	Himes	O'Rourke
Bustos	Hinojosa	Owens
Butterfield	Holt	Pallone
Capps	Honda	Pascarell
Capuano	Horsford	Pastor (AZ)
Cárdenas	Hoyer	Payne
Carney	Huffman	Pelosi
Carson (IN)	Israel	Perlmutter
Cartwright	Jackson Lee	Peters (CA)
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Peters (MI)
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Pingree (ME)
Chu	Johnson, E. B.	Pocan
Ciilline	Kaptur	Polis
Clark (MA)	Keating	Price (NC)
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Quigley
Clay	Kennedy	Rangel
Clyburn	Kildee	Richmond
Cohen	Kilmer	Roybal-Allard
Connolly	Kind	Ryan (OH)
Cooper	Kirkpatrick	Sanchez, Loretta
Courtney	Kuster	Sarbanes
Cuellar	Langevin	Schakowsky
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Schneider
Davis, Danny	Lee (CA)	Schwartz
DeFazio	Levin	Scott (VA)
DeGette	Lewis	Scott, David
Delaney	Lipinski	Serrano
DeLauro	LoBiondo	Sewell (AL)
DelBene	Loeback	Shea-Porter
Deutch	Lofgren	Sherman
Dingell	Lowenthal	Sinema
Doggett	Lowey	Sires
Doyle	Lujan Grisham	Slaughter
Duckworth	(NM)	Smith (NJ)
Edwards	Luján, Ben Ray	Speier
Ellison	(NM)	Swalwell (CA)
Engel	Lynch	Takano
Enyart	Maffei	Thompson (CA)
Eshoo	Maloney,	Thompson (MS)
Esty	Carolyn	Tierney
Farr	Maloney, Sean	Titus
Fattah	Matheson	Tonko
Fitzpatrick	Matsui	Tsongas
Foster	McCollum	Van Hollen
Frankel (FL)	McDermott	Vargas

Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky

Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters

Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—19

Aderholt
Barton
Cleaver
Conyers
Crowley
Gabbard
Garamendi

Gingrey (GA)
Guthrie
Heck (NV)
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
Ruiz

Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Smith (WA)
Stockman

□ 1631

Ms. SINEMA changed her vote from "aye" to "no."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 10 on Final Passage of H.R. 2279, the Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations Act of 2013, I am not recorded because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR VINCENTE "BEN" GARRIDO BLAZ

(Ms. BORDALLO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleagues to join me here as I deliver this eulogy for a former Member of Congress.

I rise to pay tribute to the late Vicente "Ben" Garrido Blaz, Guam's former Congressman and a retired brigadier general in the United States Marine Corps. Ben passed away last night at the age of 85.

Ben was a longtime friend whose lifetime of service to Guam and our Nation has been an inspiration to generations. As a survivor of the Japanese occupation of Guam during World War II, Ben had a strong sense of patriotism and duty to our country. He was commissioned as an officer of the Marine Corps in 1951 and went on to become the first Chamorro to achieve the rank of brigadier general. In 1984, Ben was elected to serve in this House of Representatives, where he represented the people of Guam for four terms.

Throughout my time in Congress, Ben has been a strong source of support and guidance. I am grateful for his counsel and friendship, and I will miss him dearly.

I join the people of Guam mourning the loss of Congressman Ben Blaz. Our thoughts and prayers are with his sons, Mike and Tom, and their families.

I now ask for the House to observe a moment of silence in remembrance of Congressman Blaz.

I thank my colleagues who have joined me here, Mr. Speaker.

OPPOSITION TO UNESCO FUNDING

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong opposition to attempts in the omnibus budget bill to restore any U.S. funding to UNESCO, a corrupt entity that is an extension of an anti-America, anti-Israel U.N. agenda.

UNESCO is attempting to pull a bait and switch on the American public. It says that it will use our constituents' money on World Heritage sites in our districts, but what it really wants is to use the funds that it lost when it admitted Palestine to its club.

UNESCO knew what would happen to it if it admitted Palestine, but the agency counted on this administration to give it the money anyway. Not only is money fungible, Mr. Speaker, but studies indicate that there is no guarantee that this designation of World Heritage site is beneficial to the local economy.

Taxpayer money for UNESCO is included in next week's omnibus budget bill. UNESCO must not receive a dime unless it reverses its decision on Palestine. I urge my colleagues to see through this guise and to continue to support American principles and U.S. law.

KELLOGG LOCKOUT

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of discussion recently about extending benefits to the unemployed, and it is critical we do that.

I would like to talk about 226 people who are in my district who have jobs but still can't come to work to perform those jobs and get paid. They worked at the Kellogg plant in Memphis, making cereal like Corn Flakes and Frosted Flakes, but they have been locked out by Kellogg since October 22 due to a national contract dispute.

The company, with sales of \$14 billion at last estimate, hopes to bring in so-called "casual" employees who would be paid less and work fewer hours and get fewer benefits than the steady middle class jobs that the company offers now.

I am proud Kellogg is in my district, and I have toured their plant. When I am flying out of Memphis, I drive up and down Airways Boulevard. I go past the Kellogg plant, and I see those employees out each day, day and night, even in 10-degree weather earlier this week. Like the post office, they are out in rain, snow, or sleet. I see them on holidays, weekends, you name it, fighting for their rights, standing up for themselves.

It is time to end this lockout. Put those people back to work. Let's produce our cereal with good Memphis employees.

SEX TRAFFICKING AT THE SUPER BOWL

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the United States is gearing up for the next Super Bowl. Unfortunately, so are human sex traffickers. Super Bowl Sunday is not just the sporting event of the year; it has also become America's traveling human trafficking magnet. Exploiters roam the streets looking for prey.

Last year, while the two teams battled it out on the field, a young trafficked girl prayed for her life while sold for sex. These are women and children who have been taken as sex slaves, becoming sought-after entertainment on Super Bowl weekend.

New Jersey's efforts toward eliminating this dastardly deed are to be commended. Hopefully, they are successful in curbing modern-day slavery at the Super Bowl. But this crime ought not to be, not at a major sporting event, not in our neighborhood.

That is why CAROLYN MALONEY and I have introduced H.R. 3530, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, which will go after the traffickers and the consumers of this slavery. We need to protect victims and prosecute the slave trafficking deviants.

And that's just the way it is.

EXTEND EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

(Mr. GARCIA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, our priority in Congress should be to find solutions, to boost our economy and get people back to work. While we are still working to get our economy back on track, Americans need to be able to feed their families and support themselves. It is about fairness.

That is why I urge my colleagues today to extend the emergency unemployment insurance. For every dollar spent on unemployment insurance, we generate \$1.55 in new economic activity in its first year, which is why we create more jobs and will get Americans back to work.

In Florida alone, 70,000 people have lost this essential lifeline during the holiday season. And if we don't act, this number could double in the next 6 months.

Mr. Speaker, this is simply a question of fairness. It is the right thing to do for our families and for our economy.

BROWSE ACT

(Mr. DUFFY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about ObamaCare this afternoon and the fact that the President came out to the American people and said that healthcare.gov was going to work

like Amazon and Kayak, Web sites where consumers are able to go shop for products, and if they find a product that they like, then and only then do they have to put in their personal information—their date of birth, their credit card, their full name and address.

Healthcare.gov doesn't work that way. Before Americans can shop for products on healthcare.gov, they have to put all of their information—their address, their date of birth, their Social Security number—into a Web site that isn't secure.

I am introducing the BROWSE Act to make sure that Americans have an opportunity to search the Web site, look at products, and only if they find a product that they like, only then do they have to put in their personal information. Healthcare.gov should work like the rest of the Internet and the marketplace.

WAR ON POVERTY

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 50th anniversary of President Johnson's announcement of the war on poverty.

I recently had the opportunity to visit the Lyndon B. Johnson Presidential Library and Museum in Austin, Texas, and I was astonished by just how much he and the Congress were able to accomplish during his time in office. Since 1967, poverty has declined by more than a third. Still, 49.7 million Americans live in poverty, including 13.4 million children, but the war on poverty and the programs really worked. Here are some of them:

Medicare, Medicaid, food stamps, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Head Start, school lunch, child nutrition, migrant assistance, Job Corps, legal assistance, small business and rural loans, and Indian reservation programs.

All of those were put into effect and really worked.

Dana Milbank had an article today in The Washington Post where he said, And what is the response to the 50th anniversary? It is the Republicans declaring war on the war on poverty, as they have for the last 50 years.

It is time for us to work together and continue to end poverty.

□ 1645

HONORING SERGEANT JACOB HESS

(Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a very heavy heart that I rise today to honor the life of Sergeant Jacob Hess.

Jacob is a 22-year-old American hero—the embodiment of the greatness

that gave birth to the country he so deeply loved. Raised in a military family, after graduating from North Central High School in Spokane, Washington, he joined the United States Marine Corps to serve and defend this country.

Jacob lost his life just a few days ago, New Year's Day, while supporting Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan. He lost his life in the name of American freedom. He lost his life to protect all of ours.

He leaves behind a community that admired him, a country that pays him homage, and a family that has been forever changed by him. He was a son, a brother, and a husband. He says goodbye to the family that got the call they hoped they never would.

May God bless Sergeant Jacob Hess; his mother, Keirsten Lyons; his father, Mike Hess; his brother, Cameron; and his wife, Bridget. May God bless his family and all the brave men and women who have answered America's call to freedom.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WAR ON POVERTY

(Mr. ENYART asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, it is the 50th anniversary of the war on poverty. Although in many ways it has been a success, economic opportunity is still too often a stacked deck. Yesterday, The Wall Street Journal stated that J.P. Morgan, the giant Wall Street bank, last year paid out nearly \$22 billion due to misdeeds and misrepresentations.

The stock market sets new records every day. Wall Street has recovered. When will Main Street?

While this is happening, 41 percent of the unemployed people in my district have been out of work for more than 26 weeks. They have run out of unemployment because Congress failed to act. The income difference between the wealthy and workers is greater than any time since the 1920s.

Mr. Speaker, when will a nation that proclaims itself a bastion of freedom, both economic and personal, free the poor from the shackles of poverty?

CONGRATULATING THE TOP THREE AWARD WINNERS FOR THE 2013 PENN STATE UNIVERSITY CIVIC ENGAGEMENT PUBLIC SPEAKING CONTEST

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the top three award winners for the 2013 Penn State University Civic Engagement Public Speaking Contest.

Students for the competition are nominated by their classmates in recognition

of their speaking performances throughout the semester. In total, 1,500 students vie in the competition. Their speeches are what Aristotle, who wrote about rhetoric, would classify as "deliberative," meaning their work is intended to spark public dialogue on matters of social or cultural importance.

The contest is judged by representatives from Pearson, The New York Times, Penn State, and the State College community.

For this year's competition, Amanda Hofstaedter of Chalfont, Pennsylvania, won first prize for her piece titled, "Mandatory GMO Labeling: A Win-Win for Companies and Consumers."

Sarah Bastian of State College, Pennsylvania, took second place for her work titled, "Driving Down Demand: An Answer for Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking."

And finally, Prithvi Nilkant of Mars, Pennsylvania, took third place for her work entitled, "Creating a Safer Society for All."

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate these winners, along with all the competing students, for not only their hard work, but also for their creativity and for their passion for public engagement.

NEXT STEP IN WAR ON POVERTY

(Mr. CLYBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, in 1964, when President Johnson declared war on poverty, this, the richest Nation in the world, had a poverty rate of 19 percent. By 1973, 9 years later, that rate had been brought down to 11 percent. We were definitely winning the war on poverty.

Unfortunately, too many politicians found success running down the achievements of the war on poverty. Scapegoating "welfare queens" furthered a narrative that the war on poverty was not worth fighting. But nothing could be further from the truth.

For example, Medicare and Medicaid, two poverty programs, made a difference, a tremendous difference, in the health security of older Americans. These two antipoverty programs have reduced the poverty rate of our senior citizens from over 30 percent to less than 10 percent.

The Congressional Black Caucus' 10-20-30 initiative targets communities of need with effective infrastructure investments. This proven approach was pioneered in the Recovery Act of 2009. Expanding this effective poverty fighter should be our next step in the long march of the war on poverty.

CONGRATULATING GRANDFALLS-ROYALTY

(Mr. GALLEG0 asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I couldn't let the first week in Congress go by without taking a moment to congratulate Grandfalls-Royalty.

Grandfalls-Royalty is one of the smallest public schools in Texas, with a student head count of about 27 kids. They had 16 of those guys in uniform not so long ago to play in the State championship six-man football game. I am proud to say that Grandfalls-Royalty defeated Milford 73-28.

Grandfalls-Royalty made their first debut in a State playoff game. It was held in the home of the Dallas Cowboys, the \$1.2 billion home of the Dallas Cowboys. Frankly, it was also called. For the 13th time this season, it was called by the 45-point mercy rule. That meant the game ended with still 6 minutes and 28 seconds to play in the fourth quarter. Quite an accomplishment for a small school, one in west Texas that I am very, very proud of.

Congratulations to Grandfalls-Royalty.

UNCERTAINTY WITH IRAN

(Mr. QUIGLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the United States finds itself in a period of great uncertainty in the face of a new short-term deal with Iran.

The fact that Iran has finally come to the negotiating table is only proof that sanctions are working. The strength of our sanctions has severely devalued Iran's currency, crippled its economy, and forced it to finally consider curbing its nuclear program.

While we are hopeful for a broader deal, it is imperative that the United States and the international community remain vigilant. A nuclear Iran is the most pressing national security threat not only for the United States, but also for our allies in the Middle East, especially Israel.

As talks move forward, our security and the security of our allies in the region must remain our number one priority.

EMPLOYER MANDATE UNDER THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on the topic of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, back last summer when the President unilaterally announced that he was going to not enforce the employer mandate under the Affordable Care Act, I was quite surprised because the next day there was a news article in *The New York Times* about it. Democratic Senator TOM HARKIN was quoted in the article. He was one of the architects of the Affordable Care Act. He said, speaking of the President: This was the law. How can he do that? How can the President simply unilaterally choose to ignore the law?

Our Founders, Mr. Speaker, designed a system of government based upon a separation of powers. The legislative branch enacts the laws and the executive branch, the President, enforces those laws. They did that to protect our very, very fragile freedom. We cannot allow those separations to be eroded. One man who can both make the laws and enforce the laws is more a monarch than a President.

Article II, section 3 of the Constitution requires, in part, that the President take care to faithfully execute the Nation's laws. In 1792, when George Washington was faced with enforcing an unpopular whiskey tax, he wrote in a letter that:

It is my duty to see that these laws are executed. To permit them to be trampled upon with impunity would be repugnant to that duty.

President Obama, on the other hand, has, throughout his administration, picked and chosen which laws or parts thereof he wishes to enforce. House Resolution 442 would require the House of Representatives to institute a lawsuit against the President to comply with this article II, section 3 of the Constitution. It lists four specific examples where the President has either failed to enforce the laws or has gone beyond the laws as written:

One is the 1-year delay in the employer mandate under ObamaCare, which I mentioned earlier;

Another is the 1-year extension of the substandard insurance policies, which by my definition is any insurance policy anybody would really want to buy;

One is the waiving of the work requirements under the welfare laws; and One is the granting of deferred removal action to illegal aliens.

Again, one man empowered to both enact the laws and enforce the laws is more a monarch than a President. This is not a Republican issue. This is not a Democrat issue. It is not a Tea Party action. This is not for messaging. H.R. 442 merely recognizes that no American, including the President, is above the law.

What would we say if the next President came in and said, I don't like the Affordable Care Act and, therefore, I am not going to enforce the individual mandate, which would gut the law? What would we say if President Obama or any other President said, I think the

top income tax rate is too high and, therefore, I am not going to enforce it, or I am not going to enforce the lowest income tax rate? What is the difference between those situations and what President Obama is doing right now not enforcing the employer mandate under ObamaCare? After all, the Supreme Court has ruled that the penalties under ObamaCare are a tax.

What would we say if a President said, I am not going to enforce this tax against my friends but I will against my enemies, or I am not going to enforce it against my contributors but I will against everybody else? What is the difference between that situation and what the President has done granting 1,300 unilateral exemptions to different groups under the Affordable Care Act?

If the President is allowed to make the law or to ignore those laws passed by Congress, Congress can just go home; there is no need for the legislative branch. In fact, when Congress, following the President's lead, when the House of Representatives passed a bill that would delay the employer mandate for a year, which the President had already announced he was going to do unilaterally, the President threatened to veto it.

□ 1700

At this time, I yield to Representative MARTHA ROBY from Alabama.

Mrs. ROBY. Thank you so much to my colleague from South Carolina. I just want to tell you that, as I travel throughout Alabama's Second District, the question I get over and over and over again is: What can we do about this executive overreach?

So I rise, Mr. Speaker, today on behalf of the people of Alabama's Second Congressional District to lend my support to Mr. RICE's S.T.O.P. Resolution in order to stop this overreaching Presidency. I appreciate so much the diligent and thorough work of my colleague's on this resolution, and I am proud to sign on as a cosponsor.

In advancing this resolution, we are seeking to finally stop constitutional overreaches by the executive branch and restore the separation of powers by bringing legal action against the Obama administration to compel the judiciary to rein it in. This resolution directs a civil action on behalf of the House of Representatives in Federal court in the District of Columbia, challenging four unilateral Obama administration actions, as have already been explained, that blatantly flout constitutional restraints on the executive branch. I am going to mention them again:

Specifically, these include the lifting of the Affordable Care Act's mandated requirements on the type of insurance providers can offer; the 1-year delay of the health care law's employer mandate; the adoption of a policy against deporting certain illegal immigrants, which is counter to U.S. immigration and naturalization laws; and the decision to waive the "welfare to work" laws.

Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration is certainly not the first administration to overstep its constitutional authority as, I would say, most Presidents in recent history have pushed the limits of executive power, but the actions taken in the last few years have been especially blatant and egregious. President Obama and his administration have recklessly stretched the scope of the executive branch, aggressively imposing by administrative rule or regulation what they can't achieve legislatively. When I am at home and am talking with my constituents about this, we talk particularly about the promulgation of rules. It is just a backdoor attempt to get done what the President can't get done here in the Congress.

Amazingly, in some cases, the administration has moved to delay, tweak or to otherwise alter the very health care law he pushed to enact, all while dismissing legislative proposals that would have had the same effect but would have had the benefit of being legal because they would have gone through the Halls of Congress. If allowed to stand unchecked, such actions present a dangerous threat to our constitutional separation of powers.

Mr. Speaker, I wish this weren't necessary. I wish President Obama and his administration had the self-restraint to act within their constitutional bounds, but this administration's pattern of aggressively overstepping its authorities to implement policy and win political battles leaves us no choice to act. Our constitutional restraints on government are not always convenient for political or policy goals, but they are necessary for preserving the checks and balances that ensure this government still derives its authority from the people and not the other way around.

We know that working through the courts can take time, but the judicial branch has shown a greater willingness as of late to rein in these overreaches from the Obama administration. Two recent decisions that are worth noting have already struck down the Obama administration's attempts to flout the law and act outside of the constitutionally prescribed role of the executive branch.

One was the lower court's ruling overturning the President's attempt to appoint NLRB members without Senate approval, and the other was a rare mandamus order from the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals that rejected the administration's attempt to simply not enforce laws related to Yucca Mountain and nuclear waste.

Mr. Speaker, this S.T.O.P. Resolution allows the House of Representatives to seek the intervention of the judicial branch to rein in these executive abuses and reconstitute the separation of power. I hope it also sends a message to the Obama administration that this body, as one half of a coequal branch of the United States Government, is not going to stand by and watch the ero-

sion of this country's constitutional framework.

Again, a sincere thank you to my colleague from South Carolina for taking the lead on this, for showing leadership. I am proud to be able to state to the people of Alabama's Second District, when asked "What are you doing about this?," that this S.T.O.P. Resolution is a step in the right direction. So thank you very much.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Thank you, Mrs. ROBY.

I yield to my friend and colleague from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and colleague TOM RICE for introducing this important resolution. I am proud to stand in support of this, and I thank him for giving me a few minutes to discuss what is a very, very important issue today.

My friend knows that I was a writer. Before I came to Congress, I wrote a number of books. I spent a lot of time writing about and studying this great Nation—about the history of this Nation, about the history of the world—and I think I know a little bit about some of these things. I think one of the most remarkable but underappreciated characteristics of General George Washington, who was, I think, a hero for many of us, was his deference to the Continental Congress during the American Revolution. Although in many cases he knew what needed to be done, he always recognized that he derived his authority—he derived all of his power—not from himself but from the Congress, and he understood that the Congress was the organization and the body that held the power and the keys to a successful government.

It is a lesson, as we have been discussing here tonight, that, unfortunately, this President does not seem to appreciate or to even understand.

Our Founding Fathers made it very clear in the Constitution that the responsibility of the President was to take care that the laws be faithfully executed—not selectively chosen, not preferred or some of them ignored, but faithfully executed. It is his constitutional responsibility, but time and time again, we have seen this President as he ignores this constitutionally mandated responsibility. He prefers to pick and to choose which laws he will enforce.

I would like to quote eminent Judge Michael McConnell, who recently wrote:

The Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel, which advises the President on legal and constitutional issues, has repeatedly opined that the President may decline to enforce laws he believes are unconstitutional, but these opinions have always insisted that the President has no authority to refuse to enforce a statute which he simply opposes for policy reasons.

This has become a very troubling trend for this President. As my friend has already pointed out, among other examples, he has already declined to enforce immigration laws against a large number of illegal immigrants. He

has chosen not to enforce work requirements that Congress mandated as part of the 1990 welfare reform programs, programs which had broad bipartisan support and which everyone recognizes were very successful. He has chosen to change the congressional requirements that States must meet under No Child Left Behind, and in none of these cases did he say he believed the laws were unconstitutional. He simply disagreed with the policies and so refused to enforce those laws. Now, we may or may not agree with the President on the merits of these policies, but as an institution, Congress should be extraordinarily concerned that the President is usurping our role as legislators, and it is setting a very dangerous precedent.

The President, for example, went to great lengths to convince the Supreme Court and other Americans that the Affordable Care Act was, indeed, constitutional. He won that battle, which means he should have to enforce this law that he argued was constitutional or, if not, come to Congress and ask for changes to the law, but over the last few months, we have seen numerous delays and exemptions to ObamaCare without any input at all from Congress. Now, once again, regardless of your views on the merits of ObamaCare, the President's actions should make everyone who respects the separation of power and the role of the executive very uncomfortable.

Can you imagine if Governor Romney had been elected President and if, on his first day in office, he had said, "I am going to delay the employer mandate"? Do you think any of my colleagues from across the aisle would have supported him in that? Imagine if he had said, again as was illustrated before, "I think that the capital gains tax is too high. To get our economy going, I am just not going to enforce the capital gains tax for a year." I mean, if he had done that, heads would have exploded all over Washington, DC.

Why would that have happened? He doesn't have the authority. The Constitution forbids it. We have a President, not a king. I don't want this President to act that way. I don't want a Republican President to act that way. Our Founding Fathers would be horrified if they were alive today and were watching what is happening with our Constitution and the growing power of the Presidency. This is dangerous, and it is demeaning to our democracy, and it simply must stop. I hope the President will remember his constitutionally mandated responsibility to enforce all laws, not just those laws that he chooses to enforce because he agrees with them.

Mr. RICE, thank you, sir, for drawing attention to this very important issue. Thank you for giving me a few moments to share this with you here on the floor of the Congress.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Thank you, Mr. STEWART.

I yield to my friend from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend from South Carolina. I appreciate his making this time available.

Mr. Speaker, truth be told, this is a leadership hour, so it tends to be Republicans down on the floor when it is a Republican leadership hour, and it tends to be Democrats down on the floor when it is a Democrat leadership hour, but as my friend Mr. STEWART said so well: this is not a Republican problem. This is not a President Barack Obama problem. This is a “we, the people” problem.

The concern is not that it is President Barack Obama who is saying the Affordable Care Act doesn't have to be enforced. The concern is that any President could say that any law doesn't have to be enforced. Thomas Jefferson said you are not likely to lose your freedoms through rebellion; you are likely to lose them little by little by little by little. That is why we all have to stand up together.

Mr. RICE is a freshman from South Carolina. I have only been here for two terms myself. I think about some of the giants of this institution, not just of the House but of the Senate as well. I think about one of my favorite Democratic Senators, Robert Byrd from West Virginia—a champion of article I of the Constitution. He was a Democrat second; he was an American first, defending the Constitution against Presidents, Republican and Democrat, who would take the people's power from Capitol Hill and take it down to the executive branch.

So I want to ask you now—and it may sound frivolous—if we had President Mitt Romney in the White House today and if Mitt Romney were deciding the Affordable Care Act did not need to be enforced, would you still be here on the floor, asking that Congress go to court to reclaim congressional powers? I ask my friend.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. As you said, Representative WOODALL, I am an American first and a Republican second, and if the President usurps the Constitution, I will call him to task.

Mr. WOODALL. I confess to you that I went on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee—as all of my colleagues know, the Oversight and Government Reform Committee is responsible for doing all of the oversight over the executive branch—because I was certain Mitt Romney was going to win. I said, for far too long, power has been leaving the people's hands on Capitol Hill, gravitating down Pennsylvania Avenue to the White House, and we in a Republican House will be able to do oversight over a Republican President and show the American people it is not about Republicans and Democrats; it is about article I and article II and about following the process, following the law, following the Constitution. It matters. It doesn't matter when times are good. It matters when things get dicey, when you begin to lose those freedoms little by little.

□ 1715

I want to ask my friend from South Carolina, because we went through this with recess appointments, whether or not there was the ability for the President to appoint folks of his choosing to various positions around the city. And what I read that D.C. court opinion to say is what President Obama has done is absolutely outrageous. It cannot possibly stand.

But what Congress allowed President Bush to do and President Clinton to do and President Bush before him to do and President Reagan before him to do, that was also unconstitutional; and Congress has to step up for the powers of the Constitution entrusted in us.

Is this your understanding?

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Representative WOODALL, that is exactly what this resolution is intended to do. It is intended for Congress to take action to enforce the Constitution.

Representative WOODALL, do you hear from your constituents back home when you speak to them that the President is breaking the law, and why don't you do something about that?

I do all the time. I think that is a result of the erosion of Congress' power—exactly what you are talking about.

Mr. WOODALL. We should absolutely have arguments on this floor about how much money should be spent on this program versus that program, whether or not we should authorize a new issue or do away with an old issue. Those are those things that divide us.

But we should be united, Republican, Democrat, House and Senate, over these constitutional issues of where does the people's power reside. Because if leaders like you, in the absence of Senator Byrd from West Virginia, in the absence of Daniel Patrick Moynihan, in the absence of some of those greats who formerly preserved the people's power, I don't know how it gets preserved.

I am certain that you face slings and arrows from folks thinking this is some sort of partisan stunt: you just don't like this President; you just have sour grapes over the last election.

I have gotten to know you well over your very short time in Congress. It is so valuable to me that you put your responsibilities as an American first—far above your responsibilities as a Republican—and that despite those slings and arrows, the Constitution comes first. It may not seem like we need the Constitution to protect us each and every day; but when we wake up and realize it is not there, it is going to be too late.

I hope this is something that spreads in a bipartisan way and in a bicameral way. We have preserved this Republic, this greatest form of government the world has ever known, only because folks have stood up when others did not see that necessity.

We need this. There is the necessity today, and I am grateful to you for your leadership.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Thank you, my friend.

I yield to my friend from Florida (Mr. YOHIO).

Mr. YOHIO. I thank my good friend from South Carolina (Mr. RICE), for bringing this resolution forward and for his leadership. This is a very important issue not only today, but as Mr. WOODALL pointed out here, also for the future of our Nation—a constitutional Republic, as you so eloquently put it.

Article II, section 3 of the Constitution specifically requires that the President:

Take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

This does not allow the President to enforce the laws he likes and ignore the laws he doesn't. This clause compels the President to ensure that all agencies within his executive branch are carrying out the laws created by Congress, the people's arm of government.

The current administration undermines this body on a near daily basis; and if it is allowed to continue to do so, as you pointed out, the balance of power will no longer exist. In fact, it is rapidly slipping away to one side of the balance scales. It is our duty as representatives of the American people to speak out about this. And if not us, who? And if not now, when?

The delay of the employer mandate, the extension of the substandard insurance policies, and the grant of the deferred removal action to certain illegal immigrants are just but a few examples of the executive attempting to legislate without Congress.

Luckily, the Framers instituted a system of checks and balances. This Congress has no choice but to turn to the courts. I offer my strong support for Congressman RICE's STOP resolution, H.R. 442, which will enable the House to bring a civil action against the executive branch and allow future legislators to hold the executive branch accountable.

I think this is the crux of this and this is the important part of this. Because it is for all future Presidents. Again, we have to stand up and start defending our Constitution.

This administration, like others before it, has no problem creating mandates for the American people, but cannot seem to follow the most important mandate of our Nation: the Constitution.

If you look at this, this simple little book, it is not an epic in volume. You can see it. It is very thin. But yet it is an epic in ideology of what free men and free women can do, and they are held accountable with their government by this little red book.

The importance of this issue cannot be overstated. We must address this now so that all future Presidents will know that they must abide by the Constitution. No President, past or present, Democrat or Republican, should ever be exempt from the duties laid out by our Founding Fathers.

That is why I support Congressman RICE's STOP resolution, H.R. 442, and I

urge all my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, to support this resolution for America and for our Constitution.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Thank you, Mr. YOHIO.

I yield to my friend from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS).

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

When we left in December to go back to our districts for the Christmas weekend, I got home and thought, Okay, the President is going to do something with ObamaCare as we get close to Christmas. You just know anytime you come up on a holiday, some news gets put out. July 3, leading into the 4th of July, was the employer mandate delay. The grandfather stunt was pulled leading into Thanksgiving.

And sure enough, December 19, the Obama administration grants a "hardship exemption" from the individual mandate tax penalty to those who have seen their plans canceled due to ObamaCare.

I don't think any of those plans should have been canceled. I offered a bill here, and the House passed something similar, to essentially grandfather in those plans. The Federal Government shouldn't be forcing people out of plans they like. Certainly, things needed to be done there.

But understand how unfair this is. If you had insurance and your policy is canceled, and then the ObamaCare replacements are not affordable for you, they are saying, Okay, you are fine. No penalty for you. But if you are somebody who couldn't have afforded insurance the prior year, and now you are told you are forced to go on these ObamaCare exchanges, you still have to pay the tax, even though you may have been worse off than some of those other folks.

Or if you are somebody that had employer coverage last year, and now maybe going out on your own and you need to buy individual insurance, if you end up in the exchanges and you don't find those affordable to you, you don't get the same relief.

When you are talking about arbitrary delays like this, it is inherently unfair.

Now, give the administration some credit. Unlike some of the other delays, there is actually a provision in ObamaCare that says people can qualify for a hardship exemption from the individual mandate. The problem is that in this instance it is ObamaCare itself that constitutes the hardship.

So because ObamaCare is implemented, these people are suffering a hardship. Therefore they are exempt from the statute. To me, I think that is an abuse of what the statute is supposed to do. Certainly, it begs the question, Could you simply delay or grant a suspension of all of these provisions of ObamaCare?

It is interesting because I was reading in the Weekly Standard publication, one of the reporters was asking

members of the Senate what are their limits, what is the principled justification for his conduct.

And so the reporter asked one Senator:

How do you determine if the President couldn't do something that it does exceed his authority? Are there any parts of the law that the President does not have the authority to delay or suspend?

The Senator's response—a Democratic Senator:

I don't know. I'm not the scholar on that.

Well, the reporter went to another Democratic Senator and said:

Are there are any delays the President wouldn't have the authority to make? Could the President potentially suspend the entire law if he wanted to?

His answer:

I can't answer a hypothetical.

The reporter asked again:

So you can't say if there are any parts of the law he couldn't delay unilaterally?

The Senator said:

I can't answer a hypothetical.

Finally, another Senator told the reporter he doesn't know of any legal impediment preventing the executive branch from delaying the employer or individual mandates.

When asked:

Couldn't a future President just simply come in and suspend the entire law?

That Senator said:

I don't want to speculate what a future President might do.

And so I think those answers, when Senators and the President's own party cannot offer any principled justification for the President's conduct that would exclude the potential of a President simply delaying all provisions of the law, you know that you are not in the realm of faithful execution of the law.

I think it is a challenge. We have talked about it in this Chamber in hours like this. We have had hearings in the Judiciary Committee with experts—even liberal constitutional law experts—saying that this conduct goes beyond what the Founding Fathers intended and what the Constitution envisioned.

I would like to see somebody offer a principled justification for the President picking and choosing which parts of the law should be enforced and should not be enforced, should be delayed, should be suspended, or should be ignored.

It is interesting, because when you go back and look at the Founding Fathers when they created the Constitution, when they created the Congress, when they created the executive, at the convention James Wilson from Pennsylvania was the one who moved to create a President consisting of a single person. And that caused silence in the convention hall because they had just rebelled against Britain. And although you needed some type of executive power, there were some who were a little bit taken aback that you would

even have a single President, even in a constitutional system. Some of the people said at the time that you can't really have a strong President and have a republic.

So this was a huge issue for the Founding Fathers. Clearly, it would not have been acceptable to stand up at the Constitutional Convention and say, Yes, the President is going to have the authority and duty to enforce the laws; but if there are laws he doesn't like, he will be able to delay provisions or ignore provisions as he sees fit, as long as it is consistent with his overall purpose or political agenda. That would not have been acceptable to anybody at the time.

Can you imagine if when John Adams succeeded George Washington, he just started delaying provisions related to the bank of the United States or the Jay Treaty? Imagine when Jefferson came in. He ran against the Alien and Sedition Act. Some of those were just allowed to expire, but they went in and repealed a core portion of the Alien and Sedition Act. They didn't just ignore it. The provisions that expired, expired; and then they repealed the provisions that were still in effect.

That is the way it is supposed to be done. They would never have allowed John Adams or Jefferson to come in and just willy-nilly enforce what they wanted to and not enforce what they didn't want to.

And so part of the frustration of this is Congress is supposed to stand up for its authority. I think the House people here realize that what the President is doing is not proper constitutional government, but the U.S. Senate is just totally out to lunch on this. They are not interested in safeguarding their institutional prerogatives, because they are putting their political interests ahead of the legislative body's authority. That really runs contrary to how the Founders envisioned the separation of powers and checks and balances working.

In Federalist 51 Madison said:

Ambition must be made to counteract ambition.

What he meant by that is that, yes, you have separate powers. You have an executive, a legislative, and a judicial power. But just because you separate them doesn't mean that individual liberties can be secure.

So you have got to give each branch the ability to check the other branches. And they were sure they knew people would have different partisan allegiances and all that, but they were pretty sure that each branch would have the wherewithal and would want to defend its own prerogatives.

And so in this instance, I think what you don't have is a Senate that is willing to join with the House, use the power of the purse, use the appointment power, advise and consent, all the powers that we have, use those until the President starts conforming with the law.

□ 1730

But we are not there yet. And so this idea of trying to bring this in front of courts, we shouldn't have to do that. We should be able to defend our own turf. But it is frustrating because we don't have a lot of other options at this point.

So I think that my colleague from South Carolina, you know, I give him credit for thinking of what can we actually do that could potentially be successful. And so I am hoping that this move will be successful.

But I think, going forward—and this has been a problem before this President. He is not the only one who has pulled stunts like this, although I think he has gone beyond what any previous President has done.

Ultimately, people in this body and in the other Chamber have got to get serious about defending our constitutional responsibility. That means holding Presidents accountable who are not in accordance with article II, section 3, the "Take Care" clause. But it also means not delegating so much legislative authority to these bureaucracies when they end up essentially legislating, and those rules are imposed on the public without Congress saying anything at all about it.

So, ultimately, the courts cannot save us if we aren't willing to save ourselves and protect the authority that the Constitution grants us and that we are supposed to exercise on behalf of the people that we represent.

We are, especially in this House, we are the people's House. The President gets elected, too, but we are the closest to the people, and I think we have got to do a better job of this going forward.

So I would just tell my friend from South Carolina, Thank you for doing this. I know you have signed on. I have a resolution just to say that the House doesn't approve of this conduct, because I fear if we don't do anything, then we are basically setting a precedent where this is going to be unquestioned going forward.

So I think as much as we can do, even if we are not successful, at least we are showing people that we think this is a contested practice, and we are not willing to allow this to become something that is accepted for future Presidents, Republican or Democrat.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. I thank my friend from Florida.

Separation of powers is fundamental to our form of government. The Congress enacts laws. The President enforces the laws. One individual who can both make the law and enforce it is more a monarch than a President.

Without the separation of powers, our form of government crumbles. As earlier speakers said, the erosion of the separation of powers didn't start with President Obama, but it has certainly accelerated. At home I am asked all the time, The President is breaking the law; why don't you do something about it? This resolution is an attempt to do exactly that.

Nobody would argue that the President has no discretion in enforcing the law. Clearly, he does. But in these four instances, he has clearly overstepped that discretion.

I fall back to say, what would we say if the President has the power to waive these things, the employer mandate, the penalty under the employer mandate, that is a waiver of a tax? What would we say if the next President waived the capital gains tax, or waived the maximum bracket under the income tax, or waived the income tax for his friends?

Clearly, that is beyond the discretion of the President. Clearly, President Obama has gone beyond his discretion, and Congress needs to enforce the Constitution.

We have 44 cosponsors to our bill so far, but we need the help of the American people. We need you to talk to your Representatives. If you need more information about our resolution or what you can do, please go to my Web site at www.rice.house.gov.

Thank you for your concern. Thank you for viewing. Let's protect our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members must address their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

THE CONGRESSIONAL PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus. During our Special Order hour, we want to talk specifically about the need for unemployment insurance but, more broadly, about what we need to do to make sure that everyone in this country has access to opportunity.

Just yesterday, we celebrated the 50th anniversary of the war on poverty. President Johnson said, during his State of the Union in 1964:

Unfortunately, many Americans live on the outskirts of hope, some because of their poverty, and some because of their color, and all too many because of both. Our task is to help replace their despair with opportunity.

This administration today, here and now, declares unconditional war on poverty in America. It will not be a short or easy struggle. No single weapon or strategy will suffice, but we shall not rest until that war is won. The richest nation on Earth can afford to win it. We cannot afford to lose it.

Those are the words of President Johnson 50 years ago when we started the war on poverty in this country. We created Medicare and Medicaid, the food stamp program and programs like Head Start. And we have great results from those programs.

In fact, according to a new study, these initial programs, coupled with

expansion of pro-work and pro-family programs, like the earned income tax credit, have helped reduce poverty by nearly 40 percent since the 1960s. The poverty line fell from 26 percent in 1967 to 16 percent in 2012, when the safety net is taken into account.

Now, while there has been a lot of progress, we still have far too many people in this country who are still living in poverty or on the brink of living in poverty. Fifteen percent of Americans today are living below the poverty line, and that is just \$11,490 for an individual. 46.5 million people in our country are living in poverty, and one in three Americans teeters on the brink of living in poverty. That includes 16 million children in this country. That is more than 700,000 people in my home State of Wisconsin.

According to the Institute for Research on Poverty at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, in Rock County, in my district, a county that I share with Congressman PAUL RYAN, 22 percent of the children in that county are living in poverty.

We still have vast inequality, income inequality. We have unlivable wages. And we still have Members of this body, Mr. Speaker, who want to chip away at that very economic security. It almost seems like today it is not a war on poverty, but sometimes it seems like there is a war on the war on poverty, that we are actually stepping backwards from the very improvements we made over the years from 1960.

In fact, what we noticed that just happened was the not extending of the benefits, emergency unemployment benefits back in December, on December 28. It has affected 1.3 million Americans. Not only do we have issues like that, but we also have an attack on food stamps, where this very body has voted to cut \$39 billion from the SNAP program, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program—\$39 billion—affecting millions and millions of Americans.

We have seen attempts to not allow us to raise the minimum wage, a minimum wage that is entirely behind where it should be. If you took into consideration where it should be, just for inflation from 1968, that minimum wage in 2013 dollars would be at \$10.60—not \$7.25, at \$10.60. We are way behind keeping up with inflation.

Income inequality is at an all-time high. We are finding that incomes for the top 1 percent have grown more than 31 percent since 2009, and the bottom 99 percent of people, their income has moved less than 1 percent. So we are in a challenging time.

We know that there was an economic downfall across the globe, and especially hard hit, we feel it in this country. And while we are having dual activities happen, jobs are creeping back up, we are having progress, but still, 7 percent of people are unemployed.

And while we have got those jobs creeping up, we still also notice that

people are being left behind with this economy, and that is exactly why we have tried to do things like extending the unemployment insurance benefits for people.

But unfortunately, in this body, in this very body, Mr. Speaker, austerity has ruled the day. Austerity has taken place, instead of prosperity. Instead of doing measures that would lift people out of poverty and help people get a job and help people be able to support their families, we are trying to take government down and down and down, like they did in Europe, and they have had disastrous results from doing that.

That is not a path out of our current economic condition. We need to be investing in our people so that they have those opportunities. They can grab a ring at that ladder and get a good job and be able to get by. So there are so many things we need to do.

Unfortunately, these attacks aren't just in this body, in the Congress. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, these attacks are even happening in the States.

In my home State of Wisconsin, our Governor, Scott Walker, was recently on a CNN program. And when he was asked about extending unemployment benefits, his response was, the reason why the White House is so actively pursuing this, unemployment insurance, is they want to desperately talk about anything but ObamaCare.

Can you believe the Governor of a State who is 37th in job creation, who promised when he was elected to create 250,000 jobs, and he has done a portion of that, is somehow trying to say that helping people to get out of poverty, helping people to be able to support their family with groceries and to be able to pay their rent or mortgage, at a time of still having record people who are out of work, while we are trying to start getting jobs to come back, at 7 percent, at that time, Mr. Speaker, that Governor can still only talk about ObamaCare, as all too often this body has done.

We need to act now. The time to act on this, for this body, is now. 1.3 million people are currently out of work and trying to get those benefits they need so desperately during that period that have been cut off. And every week, across the country, 72,000 new Americans will lose their benefits if we don't do something—72,000 thousand people across the country.

Mr. Speaker, in our Speaker of the House's district alone, you look at the largest cities in that district in Ohio: Springfield, Ohio, 60,000 people, that would be like having your entire city of Springfield go unemployed in a single week; in the city of Hamilton, 62,000 people, 1 week, all out of work; Middleton, 48,000 people, you can take that and the surrounding communities, all in 1 week, out of work if we don't do something.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that this body do something. 1.3 million Americans have lost these benefits at the end of December, in-

cluding 20,000 military veterans who aren't getting the benefits they need. These are hardworking people who are still trying to find jobs in this economy, but there are just not enough jobs yet available. And in many fields it is even tougher.

Right now, 24,000 Wisconsinites have lost these important, vital lifelines, and the number just keeps going up every single week by 72,000 people. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the House Republicans adjourned Congress on December 12, more than 2 weeks before these benefits were set to expire. We could have done something, we could have stayed and worked, and instead we didn't. Now, because of that, we have 1.3 million and counting people who don't have access to these vital benefits.

Now, let's just think about this. Under President Bush, five times we extended these benefits without any strings attached like this Congress is trying to do to this President, five times, and the unemployment was less than the 7 percent we are at right now. It is hypocritical for us not to do what we all did together five times under President Bush while people are still looking for work.

The bottom line is you still need this money, not just to pay for groceries and to pay for rent or your mortgage, but you need things to be able to get a job. If you don't have the ability to pay for gas in your car, how are you going to be able to find a job? You need to be able to have that car to go to interviews to find a job.

□ 1745

You need to be able to pay for your phone so you can receive a phone call for these jobs. These are all reasons why we need to make sure those benefits are available for all too many people in this country.

There is also what happens to the economy when you don't have these benefits in place. Just in the first week since Congress cut off long-term unemployment, our local economies across America lost \$400 million of potential economic activity, and that is going to grow every single week. So it is a double-whammy: not only the people who are desperately looking for work, trying to find that job, not able to find that job, but we are also going to have even more people be unemployed because of the overall impact that has on the economy.

It has been said that 200,000 jobs would be lost in 2014, and we are going to decrease the gross domestic product simply by not doing these benefits. The bottom line is, there are so many reasons why we need to do this. Later, I am going to talk more about my State of Wisconsin and why it is important.

I am joined by one of my colleagues here today who is actually the cochair of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, Representative RAÚL GRIJALVA. Representative GRIJALVA has served in Congress for six terms. He is a member of the Committee on Education and the

Workforce, and he also serves on the Committee on Natural Resources, where he is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Public Lands and Environmental Regulation.

He is a tremendous Member of Congress. He has been a mentor to many of us who are freshmen, who recently have joined, and is a very strong member of our Progressive Caucus, speaking on behalf of each and every American who needs opportunity. It is my pleasure to yield now to the gentleman from Arizona, Representative GRIJALVA.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Congressman, let me at the outset thank you for the opportunity to provide some clarity to the discussion and the lack of debate, many times, in this House about what is really important to the American people. That clarity is important to this whole Congress. It is important specifically to our Democrats and in particular to the Progressive Caucus, of which you are a member, and I want to thank you for that and for your efforts.

The Federal Emergency Unemployment Compensation program expired on the 28th because of a lack of action on the part of the majority—the majority being the Republicans—cutting off an average weekly benefit of \$300, as has been stated, to 1.3 million job seekers. Without that extension, another 72,000 Americans on average are estimated to lose their unemployment insurance every week during the first half of this new year.

All economists agree that providing extended unemployment benefits is one of the most effective job creation strategies available during a high period of joblessness. In this period of economic uncertainty, every \$1 of unemployment compensation creates 52 cents in additional economic activity beyond that dollar. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that extending benefits for another year will save 200,000 jobs.

The failure by the Republicans to extend Federal unemployment insurance at the end of last week is already taking more than \$400 million out of the pockets of American job seekers nationwide and State economies.

Unemployment insurance is viewed as a very effective stimulus because Americans without jobs tend to spend their unemployment insurance right away and on the very basic needs that they and their families need.

Democrats have called on Congress to extend the Federal emergency unemployment insurance program through 2014. Congress must act soon to restore those necessary benefits to the unemployed workers and to their families.

This economy still has 1 million fewer jobs than before the Great Recession began; 37 percent of the unemployed have been out of work for more than 6 months; almost 1.9 million more would lose their unemployment benefits in the first half of 2014, as their State benefits run out.

In my State of Arizona, the failure by the GOP, the Republicans, to reinstate and extend the unemployment compensation benefits directly affected 17,100 unemployed workers in Arizona. An additional 22,500 unemployed workers will lose their benefits in the first 6 months of 2014 if this Congress does not act.

Arizona has an average of an 8.3 percent unemployment rate throughout the State. There has been a 20 percent reduction in unemployment benefits to these workers since 2011. So we stand a chance, in Arizona, to save up to 2,000 jobs and reinstate for 17,000 people their unemployment benefits if this Congress were to act now.

We are here today, with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) managing this hour, to talk about the necessity and the urgency of the extension of unemployment benefits that has to be a priority for this Congress.

For those willing workers and their families, it is an essential, essential act by this Congress. These workers should not be pawns in political gamesmanship or in gotcha strategies by the Republicans to try to, in effect, embarrass the President. That does not need to be part of this equation. As Mr. POCAN pointed out, this has been dealt with in a bipartisan manner. This renewal, regardless of who has been in the White House, has been a response to the needs of the American people and their workers. I also believe that people receiving unemployment should not be subjected to punitive, mean-spirited requirements in order to receive that support.

We need action. We don't need posturing. We don't need empty preaching from the majority on extending unemployment benefits. That needs to be done and done immediately.

As we talk about unemployment benefits and their extension, I also want to mention that we have to realize that there is not a subtle or overly covert agenda at work here by the majority. We see the nonaction on unemployment, a vital and necessary response that, in the past, has been met with bipartisan support. We now see cuts amounting to \$20 billion in nutrition and basic sustenance support for people in need, the SNAP program in the farm bill. That cumulative effect of \$20 billion will affect many, many families, children, and adults throughout this country.

There is also a growing wage and income inequality and disparity in this country. That has been as a consequence of policies in which we reward those that are doing well—and God bless them, and they should do well, and we should be proud of them—we reward them with tax breaks, with loopholes, and with the ability to increase their income and their purchasing power while at the same time shifting the burden of responsibility for basic services in this country to hard-working, middle class people in this country. That income inequality is

possibly one of the most dangerous economic realities that is happening to this Nation, and that, too, is an agenda that is going on and continues to go on in the policies and the initiatives that are being promoted by the majority party in this House.

There is a huge need in this country for a livable minimum wage that pays people for the actual work that they do. We can't ignore the sequester cuts and how they have directly affected child care and the ability for parents, and particularly women, to be able to work and have some security that their children are being taken care of. The cuts in that area, in Head Start, in particular, are going to be devastating; early childhood education, the cuts in that area, and the freedom that it would provide parents to be able to feel secure about being at work while their children are learning and being taken care of.

The cuts in job training and the ability for people to seek new careers and change the orientation of where they are working, that has been cut. Public education, an investment strategy that, in hard economic times, has been critical to our country, again, is being cut. Access and affordability of higher education, again, being cut.

There has been no jobs bill. It was interesting to hear the Speaker of the House say the other day that it is the Democrats' fault that there is no jobs agenda that has been presented. There has been a jobs agenda presented over and over again by a variety of colleagues in this House, in the Senate, and by the administration. The inaction and them turning their face to that reality has been a consequence of the leadership in this House that has refused to deal with that.

Unemployment benefits are part of a greater crisis, a crisis of economic fairness in this country, a crisis that demands that this Congress look beyond its own rhetoric and look at the reality.

In my district, every time in our office people come in seeking help from us, and, invariably, the biggest request is, How can I find a job? How can I get trained for a new career? How can I get myself in a situation where I can go back to work and feel secure in taking care of and supporting my family? For single heads of households, it is the same issue.

I would suggest that if we really want to deal with the economics and not just provide rhetoric about jobs that we look at the first necessary step: extend these unemployment benefits, provide some security and some sustainability to millions of workers in this country, and then move on to the real agenda, which is to provide some fairness to these workers and some opportunities to these workers.

Again, Congressman POCAN, I appreciate the time and yield back.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Congressman GRIJALVA, for so articulately outlining the austerity policy of the House

Republican leadership and their stunning lack of ability to get anything done to help the 1.3 million people who are out of work and the 72,000 Americans each and every week that are going to lose their benefits if this House doesn't act.

It is now my pleasure to introduce a stalwart progressive in the U.S. Congress, the ranking member of the House Committee on Financial Services, as well as a member of the House Steering and Policy Committee. She is a member of the Congressional Progressive Caucus and was past chair of the Congressional Black Caucus. It is my honor to now yield to Representative MAXINE WATERS.

Ms. WATERS. I would certainly like to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin, Representative MARK POCAN, for yielding to me, and I congratulate him for organizing this Congressional Progressive Caucus Special Order on unemployment insurance.

Fifty years ago this weekend, in his the State of the Union address, President Lyndon B. Johnson declared a war on poverty. He introduced Federal legislation, even proposed State initiatives that would over time improve health, education, nutrition, and access to housing, employment, and economic opportunity.

Although America has changed a great deal since that day, poverty and economic inequality are still at the forefront of our Nation's problems. They are only exacerbated by the Great Recession. The gap between the rich and poor in America has become a chasm. Today, 20 percent of the income in our country goes to the top 1 percent of Americans, and the top 1 percent holds about 40 percent of the country's wealth. This inequality is mirrored in our communities, our housing and rental markets, and our financial system, where a lack of access to banking services often causes working families to have debts that spiral out of control.

Mr. Speaker, inequality in this country has reached a point that for many, the American Dream of upward mobility and unlimited economic opportunity has been greatly diminished.

The 2008 financial crisis cost our economy \$12 trillion, as millions lost their homes and jobs. This destruction of wealth disproportionately hurt our Nation's most vulnerable and only widened the gap between the rich and the poor. Even the gains from growth during the recent recovery have overwhelmingly benefited the wealthiest people in society.

Almost 95 percent of the income gains since the recovery began have been captured by the top 1 percent. Meanwhile, the minimum wage has not been increased since 2009. Mr. Speaker, this is totally unacceptable. Chronic unemployment and poverty still plague many of our communities. American families are still struggling to make ends meet. Four million Americans have been out of work for 27 weeks or

more, and the economy still has 1 million fewer jobs than before the Great Recession began.

□ 1800

Those there are other factors at play. Much of this inequality is a result of some of the government policies that we make, and government policy can help reverse these alarming trends.

But instead, our friends on the opposite side of the aisle are digging us deeper and deeper into this crisis. They passed the farm bill that cuts SNAP nutrition program for low-income families by \$40 billion, and then the Republicans let unemployment insurance for the long-term unemployment expire 3 days after Christmas.

Already, 1.3 million unemployed Americans have lost their Federal unemployment insurance. That includes 20,000 military veterans. Each day this program sits expired, thousands of additional struggling Americans are adversely affected.

As State benefits are exhausted in the first 6 months of 2014, an additional 1.9 million Americans will lose their unemployment insurance. In fact, every week another 72,000 job-seekers will lose their benefits during the first half of this year.

Mr. Speaker, unemployment insurance is critical to struggling families. According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, unemployment insurance kept 2.5 million people above the poverty line in 2012, including 600,000 children.

Unemployment insurance is good for the economy. According to Moody's Analytics, every dollar of unemployment insurance generates \$1.55 in new economic activity in the first year. The bipartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that 200,000 jobs could be lost in our economy if unemployment insurance is not extended.

We must act and act immediately to extend unemployment insurance. So I call on my Republican colleagues to bring the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act, that is H.R. 3824, to the House floor and pass it now.

With one in five American children living in poverty, it is clear that the war on poverty has gone on for far too long. Let's take action now to have all Americans share in our Nation's growth and prosperity. Let's bring an unemployment extension bill to the floor, and let's bring it now. Let's bring a substantive jobs bill to the floor now, and let's bring a minimum wage increase to the floor now. American families have suffered enough. It is time to restore the American Dream.

As I wrap up, let me just say this on behalf of the American people. I hear these arguments every day from the opposite side of the aisle saying if you can continue to extend these unemployment benefits, you are simply going to undermine the will for people to go to work. What you are going to do is make them comfortable on these

unemployment benefits, and they won't go look for a job.

Well, I want to tell you I have not talked to everyone whose on unemployment or who needs extended benefits; but I can tell you this, American folks want jobs, they want to work, they want to earn a decent living, they want to earn wages to take care of their families and their children. Their aspirations and their goals are the same as yours and mine. They want what America has promised.

I would say to those who would continue this argument, don't disrespect the American people that way. Don't undermine the American people that way. Do what you know is right, what makes good sense, and let us help out those who are the most vulnerable, who need us now at this time so that they can continue to look for jobs, so that they continue to aspire to have the American Dream, and I thank you very much.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you so much, Representative WATERS. Your efforts over the years have been so appreciated by so many, and I hope the House Republican leadership will listen to your pleas and bring this to a vote.

It is now my honor to introduce one of my fellow freshmen who has rapidly been recognized not only for his hard work and effort, but for his skills, and his work on behalf so many across this country. I would like to yield some time to my colleague Representative JEFFRIES.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, the Badger State, for his continued leadership, and each and every week when we are in session coming to the floor of the House of Representatives and articulating the progressive message for all to hear and for the good of the country. I appreciate you yielding some time during this Congressional Progressive Caucus Special Order.

This month we marked the 50th anniversary of the declaration of the war on poverty. We know that on January 8, 1964, President Lyndon Baines Johnson came to this very Chamber, spoke to a joint session of Congress, and laid out a series of initiatives designed to combat chronic poverty in this country.

As a result of this effort, there were many legislative battles that were won: in the march toward the creation of a Great Society, Medicare, Medicaid, Head Start, school breakfast program, the Food Stamp Act, minimum wage enhancement, Job Corps, college work study. These were programs all part of that Great Society era enacted between 1964 and 1966; and taken together with other war on poverty initiatives, they managed to rescue millions and millions of Americans from their impoverished condition and set them on a pathway toward the middle class.

Over the years, we have attempted to continue that war on poverty with great success such that the situation in America now is better than it was in

1964; yet we know that the war continues. Instead, it seems like as opposed to waging a war on poverty here in this Chamber, many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have decided to embark on a war against the poor, a war against middle class families and senior citizens, those who are striving to realize the full potential of the American Dream. And that's why we are also so troubled by the failure to extend long-term unemployment benefits.

Now, I arrived in this Chamber feeling as if I was prepared for the experience, given the professional and educational legislative experiences that I had had in advance of January 3, 2013. And it has been my honor and my privilege to work with such a tremendous class of freshmen.

I have been troubled over the last year by the fact that I appeared deficient in one area, and that is in my failure to have any meaningful experience in the art of hostage negotiation. But from the very beginning that I set forth in this Chamber, it seemed as if those skills were necessary in this climate.

In January of 2013, we had to wait more than 75 days before this House would pass a Superstorm Sandy relief package, unprecedented in the history of this Congress' response to a natural disaster because there were some who put forth a ransom note, demanding offsets, even though never had that happened in the history of the Republic.

Then several months later, in the run-up to October 1, you had an Affordable Care Act law passed by this Congress in 2010, signed by the President, declared constitutional by the Supreme Court in an opinion parenthetically written by Chief Justice John Roberts, and then reaffirmed with the overwhelming electoral college election of the President in 2012. Notwithstanding any of that, you had folks demanding an exchange for keeping the government open: that we either delay, destroy, or defund the Affordable Care Act. Again, a ransom note exercise.

Here we are, 1 year removed from my inaugural experience around the Superstorm Sandy debacle back again facing an almost unprecedented situation where the majority has said, in exchange for us renewing long-term unemployment benefits for Americans that reasonable people should conclude are in need, not only do we want a pay-for, almost unprecedented, the last 17 times that this has been extended, but we have got a whole list of ransom demands that we want enacted in order for us to rescue these Americans who are in distress.

I am just hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that we can get together subsequent to the United States Senate which has signaled and indicated its willingness to move forward, see to it that it shouldn't be the case that in exchange for taking a positive step forward in this institution, we always have to take two steps backward.

The positive step would simply be to renew the provision of unemployment benefits for the long term, individuals who have been working hard to find a job, and then coming together to figure out collectively how we can all move forward in the best interest of this country and our economy. I am hopeful that that will take place in the next day or week, certainly within the month, and we will continue to press forward in that regard.

With that, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his continued leadership.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative JEFFRIES, and thank you for articulating, I guess, what I have been feeling also for the last year, my lack of hostage-taking skills. I certainly learned some in the last 12 months serving in this body.

It is now my pleasure to yield some time to my colleague from California, Representative LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, who is the first Mexican American woman to be elected to Congress. She cofounded the bipartisan Congressional Study Committee on Public Health. She became the first woman to chair the Congressional Hispanic Caucus and serves as the chairwoman of their health care task force.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to commend Congressman POCAN for his leadership and his hard work on this very, very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of 1.4 million Americans who lost their emergency unemployment insurance during the holiday season and the millions of Americans who stand to lose their benefits in 2014 if Congress fails to extend unemployment insurance.

It is an insult to the American worker to oppose the extension of these benefits on the premise that emergency unemployment insurance provides a disincentive to work and that it makes unemployed Americans content to live off of the taxpayer-supported benefits.

The reality is, Mr. Speaker, that Americans have a strong work ethic and are the best and most productive in the world. And the reality is that in spite of their efforts to find employment. There are still 1.3 million fewer jobs today than there were when many of these Americans lost their jobs due to our country's economic downturn. It is unconscionable to punish those who lost their job through no fault of their own and continue to actively seek work.

With nearly three job-seekers for every available position, American workers are unemployed not because they are not motivated to work, but because there are simply not enough jobs for everyone who needs one. This problem is magnified in my home State of California where there are 400,000 fewer jobs available today than there were 6 years ago.

Unemployment benefits average \$300 per week and replace less than 50 percent of prior earnings. Yet these bene-

fits can make the difference between homelessness and hunger. They are often the only means of keeping a roof over one's head and putting food on the family table. For example, in 2012, unemployment benefits kept an estimated 2.5 million Americans, including 600,000 children, out of poverty.

It is also worth noting that unemployment benefits do more than provide a critical lifeline for out-of-work Americans. It is estimated that each dollar of unemployment insurance generates \$1.50 in new economic activity. This means our economy is losing \$400 million every week Congress refuses to extend these benefits.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office also estimates that the economy will lose 200,000 jobs if emergency unemployment insurance is not extended.

Unemployment insurance is a moral imperative that will also keep our economic recovery moving in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, we are a country of hardworking Americans. We must not turn our backs on those who need this critical Federal assistance as they struggle to find work.

□ 1815

I strongly urge Speaker BOEHNER and Leader CANTOR to schedule floor action on extending emergency unemployment insurance benefits without delay.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you so much.

It is so important to note that 37 percent of the people who receive these benefits have been searching for a job over 6 months, the very people who are going to be affected, 72,000 a week if this House doesn't act.

I now yield to another colleague, someone who has been a stalwart member of the Progressive Caucus, is the senior whip for the Democratic Caucus, and she is currently a member of the Judiciary Committee and the Homeland Security Committee and a strong advocate for people who are trying to lift themselves out of poverty and find opportunity in America.

It is my pleasure to yield to Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind leadership, because it is kind leadership, and I am very privileged to be very proudly a member of the Progressive Caucus, serving as the vice chair liaison on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus to the Progressive Caucus and a member of the Executive Committee and have watched this caucus take on hard issues. First, of course, issues that dealt with the idea of minimum wage and the underpayment, if you will, of Federal contractors paying Federal employees who are contracted to them.

We have understood the distinction of the 99ers versus the 1 percent and waged a strong battle to make sure that the 99 percent were heard. So today, I want to join the gentleman and say that time is running out. Just

this week, as I indicated earlier today and the day before, those whose benefits were cut off on the 28th are receiving those notices or are receiving empty mailboxes just in time for the end of the month and the beginning of the monthly bills. Whether it is one's mortgage or rent, whether it is the utilities that one has to pay, whether it is care of one's elderly parent or children, I can assure you that the 1.3 million, 4,000 per week, 12,000 in Harris County, 66,000 in the State of Texas, are now confronting some very difficult times.

Now, I think it should be known that when we say the term "progressive," it is also a term that celebrates the greatness of America, its diversity, its opportunity and prosperity. I have not heard one of our members of the caucus in any way challenge prosperity, victory, or success. In fact, I am going to share with my colleagues what the Houston Chronicle put on the front page: "Sales of million-dollar homes snowball here."

That gives a false image of America, congratulating those citizens and families who are able because of the greatness of this Nation, because of the hard work of themselves and so many who contribute to the economy, because of the hard work of those who are now chronically unemployed or unemployed who contributed to society and want to contribute to society, they are able to be prosperous. It is good news for the real estate industry and my friends who are in that industry and good news for small businesses, but that clouds the issue and it allows people to falsely represent that all is well.

The chronically unemployed number in the United States is higher than it has ever been. It is 2.6 percent, juxtaposed against a 7 percent unemployment rate. It varies across America.

So I want to join the gentleman with a very loud, clarion voice, hopefully a voice of clarity, that you can have prosperity. We are a capitalistic society. There is good news in Houston. But at the same time, when I held an outreach press conference on December 31, fearing the worst, that there was a full house of people looking for work, people telling their stories of how long they looked for work, and the sadness of not being able to find work, and the faith community joining in and the social network community indicating they don't know how long they are going to last with this added number of individuals. Food banks, emergency food stamps and others, they didn't know how long they were going to last.

It is imperative that we have, within these hours, movement by the other body, which we congratulate for making the first step. But I would like to say this should be an emergency, an emergency vote for a 3-month extension and then the opportunity to go forward on a more deliberative analysis of how we can fund the rest of the time.

So I would hope—we voted today. Democrats voted to extend the unemployment. I hope that the Progressive Caucus' voice will be heard. I thank the gentleman because I want the 1.3 million and growing number to be able to have the same dignity as those who can celebrate the purchase of a million-dollar home, which we don't in any way challenge, but we realize that there are people who simply want to be able to make that rental payment or mortgage payment. They can do it. Although they are making ends meet, they can do it if we recognize the importance of giving them that transitional bridge. Pass the unemployment insurance benefit now.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you so much, Representative JACKSON LEE. I think you clearly explained the dilemma we have.

While the economy is slowly bouncing back—and this President has brought us from a 9.8 percent unemployment rate he inherited down to 7 percent—and jobs are slowly being created, we still are noticing that there are still people being left behind. We have to recognize that as well.

I believe Secretary Robert Reich wrote a piece that appeared today that explained that so well. Unfortunately, due to income inequality, the gap of the percentage of people who are poor, are working but still are not earning enough, we need to talk about that as well.

I now yield to another one of my colleagues, one of my freshman colleagues who in fact has been elected by our Democratic class as the freshman class president. He serves on the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform where he is the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Job Creation and Regulatory Affairs, and is also on the Committee on Natural Resources. It is my honor to yield to Representative MATT CARTWRIGHT from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I thank my valued and trusted colleague from Wisconsin for granting me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise as a Congressman from Pennsylvania, in fact, a Congressman from Scranton, Pennsylvania, the birthplace of Secretary Robert Reich, I might add, someone we are very proud of. And I am very proud myself to be a member of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, and I rise here to speak in support of a reasonable extension for UI benefits with no strings attached.

I say "no strings attached" because every time we have extended long-term UI benefits, we have done so with no strings attached, no political wrangling, no arm wrestling. "No strings attached" means no conditions whatsoever. It is the right thing to do because you have to do it in a situation like this. In fact, five times during the George W. Bush administration, this Nation extended UI benefits on an emergency basis with no strings attached, and I see no reason why we have to depart from this American precedent today.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, the importance of fiscal responsibility. It is not like there is only one party that understands fiscal responsibility. We get that on this side of the aisle, and we get that in the Congressional Progressive Caucus as well. But the question is of timing. We want to balance the budget. We want to pay down the national debt. We get why those things are important, and we know that UI benefits can't last forever.

But the fact of the matter is it is an emergency now. As our dear friend, the gentlelady from Texas just styled it, it is an emergency now. The reason it is an emergency is the vast number of American citizens who are long-term unemployed. Mr. Speaker, 1.3 million on December 28 got cut off. In my own district in northeastern Pennsylvania, over 6,000 families got cut off on December 28, 3 days after Christmas.

The fact of the matter is this is not American tradition. Since 1959, we have never ended long-term UI benefits at a time when so many Americans are long-term unemployed. The gentlelady from Houston just mentioned it is 2.6 percent long-term unemployed in this country right now. Every other time we have cut off long-term UI benefits, it has been at a time when the people who are long-term unemployed are way less of a percentage. I think the previous highest percentage was 1.3 percent, in other words, half the percentage that we have now. Now is not the right time to cut off people from long-term UI benefits.

Mr. Speaker, these are real people we are talking about. Before my voice entirely gives out, I want to read to you a letter I got from a lady named Carol Blankenhorn from Schuylkill Haven in Schuylkill County, Pennsylvania, which I proudly represent. Carol writes:

I am writing because I am a single unemployed mother that does not get any child support and have been supporting myself and my son up until my territory at my job was dissolved. I have been very diligent in my job search, but to no avail. I believed that at least I had 26 weeks of standard benefits, but the emergency extension is so crucial to me and others because of the poor economy and the lack of jobs. I have now received a notice of exhaustion for benefits in 3 weeks, and I am devastated. I am not one of those people that are sitting back collecting. I couldn't live with myself. But now as I sit and look at my son 1 week before Christmas, I am beside myself and have no idea how I am to survive. I am urging you to please extend and renew emergency Federal extended unemployment benefits. In closing, I would ask you to please respond to me of your views and intentions on this very important issue.

That was Carol Blankenhorn, a real person from Schuylkill Haven, Pennsylvania. These are real people we are talking about. Leaving aside the damage to the economy of stopping UI benefits at this point, leaving aside all of the economic realities that favor extending UI benefits, remember above all, we are talking about real people and real families; and that alone, in the dead of winter, is a great argument

not to cut people off UI benefits at a time when it is next to impossible to find another job.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you so much, Representative CARTWRIGHT, for not only your long-time advocacy on behalf of so many people, but for sharing the personal stories, because I think that is what matters the most.

Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROTHFUS). The gentleman has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. POCAN. I have all sorts of stories that I would read but I don't have time to from construction workers who are out of work and need these benefits, from machinists who are out of work, a surgical nurse in Baraboo, Wisconsin. There are so many people who need these benefits, and the very stories that Representative CARTWRIGHT shared, I just have pages of these stories of people across the country who need these benefits to continue to get by while they are looking for work. They are not lazy. They are not sitting back. They want to work. And in this economy, they are doing everything they can to try to, but the economy is not ready for some of these people and we have to do everything we can.

I do want to read one story. I had an opportunity this afternoon to meet with a constituent from Reedsburg, Wisconsin. She was recently the winner of Half in Ten's Our American Story: 50th Anniversary of the War on Poverty Storytelling Contest. Her name is Amy Treptow. She was here with her daughter, Anna. She has benefited from programs that we have put together for people who are lower income. I will read her words:

I have always worked hard and played by the rules, but I was still living on the brink of poverty. My story is the story of millions in today's economy in which there aren't enough jobs and/or adequate training for the ones that are available. The basic need for more good jobs and training programs seems to be overlooked in today's conversation about poverty.

I am a veteran and a divorced mother with two children. I went to school to become an elementary schoolteacher but wasn't able to find full-time employment, so I enrolled in a skills enhancement program at my local community action agency in Wisconsin. The program assists low-income adults that are working a minimum of 20 hours per week to gain job skills in order to be able to have a job that pays a living wage with health benefits.

□ 1830

I was working as a contract teacher making \$15,184 a year, which is far below the poverty line for a family of three. Once I enrolled in the program, I started to take coursework to get certified as a reading specialist. The program helped me with the tuition and other school expenses and provided me with case management services. I was also living in section 8 housing and received housing counseling, as well as participating in the agency's Family Self-Sufficiency Program. I am now a full-time employee with benefits as a reading specialist instructor

helping low-income children, along with two other jobs, and I now own my own home.

And she goes on.

By providing these safety nets, the very safety nets that we celebrated yesterday on the 50-year anniversary of the war on poverty, we have helped someone like Amy and her family lift themselves out of poverty, but we have to do that right now in helping others.

I would like to, at this point, yield some time to my colleague from Illinois, someone who has been a mentor to me my entire career in the legislature, and so glad to serve with her now in Congress, a very staunch Progressive, Representative JAN SCHAKOWSKY from the State of Illinois.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded not to traffic the well while another Member is under recognition.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. If that referred to me, I apologize.

Thank you very much for organizing this hour for the Progressive Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about human issues that really don't lend themselves to any kind of political label. We are talking about people. And I think this is what has hurt me so much is the meanness, the meanness.

I just celebrated my 15th year here in the House of Representatives, and I have to tell you that we have disagreed across the aisle on a lot of different things, but the demonization of people who are struggling just to live a decent life. We are talking about people when we talk about the unemployed who aren't looking for the huge fancy job. They want to make enough to be able to raise their children comfortably, to be able to eat, put a roof over their head, just modest things that add up to a decent life.

Aside from all the arguments on why it is really dumb economically to not extend those unemployment benefits, that it will actually cost us jobs, 250,000—I don't know what the estimate is—if we don't put money in people's pockets that they can go out and spend, why would things that used to have a bipartisan consensus not prevail today?

In 1959, 1962, 1973, 1977, 1985, 1994, and 2003, we extended unemployment insurance benefits until the level of long-term unemployment—those are people unemployed over 6 months—fell below 1.5 percent. Today that is 2.6 percent of Americans. That is over 1 million Americans.

What are we doing? Who are we? That is what I asked myself around the holidays. We had a lot of cold weather and snow—typical Chicago in some ways—and people are celebrating and still going out and shopping and Christmas lights and Christmas trees. I was picturing—I know some of those families for whom this was so bleak and so unnecessary—that we could have, in 5 minutes before we left here, just extended those unemployment insurance benefits.

And you've got that sign there that says: Each week that we fail to act,

72,000 more people—that is a pretty hefty small town of people—will lose their benefits, people who only are qualified for those benefits if they are seeking work, three people searching for every job that is available in this country.

You talked to people who have experienced this ultimate sense of insecurity: What is going to happen to me and my family? What I hear at the end of that story when I talk to people is: I don't know what I am going to do. I don't know what I am going to do.

For many people, the fear of homelessness is just right outside their door right now. I don't get it.

We celebrated the—and I mean celebrated—the 50th anniversary of the announcement of the war on poverty and all the things that we did and that were supported for many years.

Thank you.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

HEALTH EXCHANGE SECURITY AND TRANSPARENCY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Health Exchange Security and Transparency Act, a bill that forces the Federal Government to notify individuals if their personal information has been stolen or unlawfully accessed through an ObamaCare exchange.

Since the disastrous rollout of ObamaCare on October 1, we have heard story after story, Mr. Speaker, of security threats and privacy concerns with the troubled ObamaCare insurance exchanges, from the chief information officer at CMS claiming that “there is also no confidence that personally identifiable information will be protected,” to an administrator at CMS saying that the ObamaCare Web site “exposed a level of uncertainty that can be deemed as high risk,” to a computer security expert calling the ObamaCare Web site “a hacker's dream.”

It is clear that the ObamaCare exchanges were never ready to be launched, and it is unconscionable that this administration would expose millions of Americans' personal information to cyber threats and identity theft.

To make matters worse, there are laws already implemented that require

private companies to notify innocent victims of these security breaches. But President Obama didn't think it was necessary to live by the same rules as the private sector and decided to push his failed agenda despite senior government officials warning him that his Web site was not safe for the American people.

Every day, Mr. Speaker, I hear from far too many hardworking families in Missouri's Second District who have seen their premiums skyrocket, wages decreased, insurance coverage canceled of late, and hours cut back at work. These families are already suffering from the harsh realities of ObamaCare. To make matters worse, they have no idea whether their personal information has been stolen or not.

Just recently, Mary Ann Schaeffer wrote to me from Kirkwood, Missouri, about how worried she is that her most intimate information could be stolen from the ObamaCare exchanges. And I quote from Mary Ann Schaeffer of Kirkwood, Missouri: “I am concerned about the security of my sensitive medical records in a big government database.” Mary Ann is just one of the many people I hear from in the St. Louis region that are worried about the devastating consequences of ObamaCare.

The only way to truly protect the American people from ObamaCare is by replacing it with free market-based solutions that expand access without destroying our economy, putting the Federal Government between you and your doctor, and lowering the quality of our care. The Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, should, at the very least, be required to report any security breaches on the ObamaCare Web site to those innocent victims who, through no fault of their own, trusted a government that deceived them.

Since President Obama decided to delay the implementation of ObamaCare for unions and businesses for an entire year, don't you think the least he could do is tell hardworking Americans if their personal information has been stolen or breached?

Mr. Speaker, the simple truth is: ObamaCare is wrong for the American people, it is wrong for hardworking Missourians, and it is wrong for the people of Missouri's Second Congressional District, and it needs to be replaced immediately before any more of its harmful provisions are implemented.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes,” a resounding “yes,” on this common-sense measure.

I would now, Mr. Speaker, yield to my good friend, the gentlelady from Tennessee, Representative DIANE BLACK, who has not only spent countless hours championing the Health Exchange Security and Transparency Act, but who has tirelessly worked to improve our Nation's health care as a small business woman and a nurse in Tennessee and now as a Member of Congress.

Mrs. BLACK. I thank the gentlelady from Missouri, my friend and my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Health Exchange Security and Transparency Act, which would provide basic protections on the healthcare.gov Web site to help Americans protect themselves from fraud and abuse. Unfortunately, we live in a time where cyber threats are rampant, and we must do what we can to make sure that Americans are protected from these threats.

John Fund at National Review recently wrote this:

Christmas shoppers were stunned to learn that computer hackers had made off with the names and other personal information of some 40 million Target customers.

But at least Target informed its customers of the security breach, as it is required by law. Healthcare.gov faces no such requirement—it need never notify customers that their personal information has been hacked or possibly compromised.

What makes this even worse is that the Department of Health and Human Services was asked to include notification provisions in the final rules for ObamaCare and they declined. Because of this decision on the part of HHS, millions of Americans' names, addresses, phone numbers, dates of birth, email addresses, and even Social Security numbers are at risk; and if they are breached by the government, they would never have to tell them.

Consider that as Americans who seek health care insurance sign onto the Federal exchange, they are inserting their personal information into a Web site that has never had a full end-to-end security test. In fact, CMS's Chief Information Security Officer, Theresa Fryer, stated in a draft memo that the Federal exchange "does not reasonably meet security requirements" and that "there is no confidence that personal identifiable information will be protected."

Even worse, experts at the credit agency Experian recently warned that the "health care industry by far will be the most susceptible to publicly disclosed and widely scrutinized data breaches in 2014."

So Experian says that it is the health care that stands the greatest risk. This prediction was based in part on reports of security risks posed by the healthcare.gov Web site since the health care law's infrastructure was put together too quickly and haphazardly.

Mr. Speaker, this Web site was never ready to go on October 1. The very least we can do is to require that the Federal Government notify someone if their personal information has been hacked. That way, at the very least, they have a chance to fend off identity theft and cyber attacks and hopefully avoid another nightmare scenario like the one we saw that happened to Target shoppers.

I urge my colleagues in the House to support this bill and for our colleagues in the Senate to swiftly send it to the President's desk.

□ 1845

Mrs. WAGNER. I thank the gentlelady from Tennessee, Representative DIANE BLACK, for her supreme leadership in this area. This is her bill. This is her piece of legislation. It has been something she has worked on tirelessly for years and has seen its exposure in both the private sector and now, unfortunately, at the Federal Government level. So I thank her for her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to my good friend, Representative RICHARD HUDSON. I thank him very much. He is a freshman Member and a dear friend and colleague, a leader in our freshman class. I thank him, not only for his work on the Homeland Security and Agriculture Committees, but also for the work that he has done in dealing with health care on the Education and the Workforce Committee.

It is now my pleasure to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. RICHARD HUDSON.

Mr. HUDSON. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that my colleague from Missouri has been a true leader in Congress.

It is a real honor to serve with you, and I thank you for your leadership, particularly on this important issue.

ObamaCare is an absolute disaster. We have seen disastrous impacts back home in North Carolina with the loss of jobs. I talk to folks every day when I go home. I go home every weekend. I travel the district. I talk to businesses, and folks tell me that they have never sat on more capital. The reason they are doing that is that they don't know what the costs of health care are going to be. So we have got businesses out there that could be expanding, that could be hiring people, but because of this health care law—because of the uncertainty created by it, because of the rising costs—we have got businesspeople who are not hiring. That is why we are not seeing job growth like we ought to see. That is why this is the flattest, longest recession we have seen in our country's history.

This awful health care law is also destroying the greatest health care system in the world. We are seeing premiums increase. I get letters and emails every day from my constituents who tell me their premiums have gone up. I talked to a woman the other day who is working three jobs. Her husband is working part-time because he can't find full-time work, but she is working three jobs just so she can pay for health care. That was before the premium increase.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen so many folks who have had their plans canceled. It has been said that the lie of the century is that, if you like your health care, you can keep it. People are seeing their health care plans canceled, and it is going to get worse because, when businesses have to start looking at whether they can afford to keep folks on their health care or not—whether the math adds up for them,

whether they can afford to do that given all the new, excessive mandates—we are going to see more people lose their insurance. It is an absolute disaster.

I am committed to doing everything I can to repeal this law and replace it because, at the end of the day, this is about people, and in this country—the greatest country in the history of the world—we can do better than this. We can offer health care that is the world's best quality health care at a price that people can afford, and we can put people in charge of their health care decisions, not bureaucrats in Washington like this awful law does, so I am committed to repealing this law.

In the meantime, I urge my colleagues to support the bill that is coming to the floor tomorrow, a bill that deals with one of the disastrous aspects of this law that I haven't mentioned yet, and that is the risk to millions of Americans that their personal information can be divulged—can be stolen—because of the lack of security on the ObamaCare Web site. This is a horrendous problem. Millions of Americans are at risk, and there is no accountability. So what we are asking for is to put that accountability in place, that if people's personal information is lost, those folks have to be notified.

The Federal Government thinks that businesses should live by that standard. The Federal Government says that States that have set up their exchanges should live by that standard. I say that the Federal Government ought to live by the same standard. If that personal information is compromised, then the individual should be notified, and the government should take responsibility and rectify the situation.

This is simple, commonsense legislation that I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I hope our colleagues in the other body, and I hope our President will support. We owe it to the American people to do the right thing—to make sure their information is secure. If something happens, God forbid, we must do the right thing and notify those individuals. We rectify the situation. We take responsibility for it.

So I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. It is the right thing to do by the American people. I urge them to vote "yes" tomorrow.

Mrs. WAGNER. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina, Representative RICHARD HUDSON, for his leadership in this area and for giving voice to not just the Health Exchange Security and Transparency Act but to the jobs issue. Certainly, what ObamaCare has done is create nothing but a part-time workforce. This is about access to care. It is about cost. It is about millions of Americans who have lost their coverage. It is about the deception of the American people. It is about a government bureaucracy—a Federal bureaucracy—telling the American people what is in their best interest.

You, the American people—your constituents, Congressman HUDSON—know

what is in their best interests when it comes to their health care and their most intimate details, whether it has to do with their personal medical records and information or whether it has to do with their costs, their coverage, their premiums, their copays. There is so much that must be repealed and replaced in this law. At the very least, what the Federal Government can do is to protect the integrity of their most private and personal information.

I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

It is now my great privilege to yield to my good friend, Representative JAMES LANKFORD from Oklahoma. He is our leader and our chairman on the Republican Policy Committee, and he is a friend and a colleague at the leadership table. I thank him most especially for the work that he does on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, which is, Mr. Speaker, monitoring the implementation of healthcare.gov and of the Affordable Care Act.

I am now pleased to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. JAMES LANKFORD.

Mr. LANKFORD. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for your oversight of this evening. The gentlelady and I do not agree at all on football, she being from Missouri and my being an Oklahoma State fan, but we do agree on this. This is a critical area, and it gets to the basic element of what we do as a Nation and what a government is supposed to do.

A government is designed to protect and to serve the people. The people don't serve the government. The government serves the people. The government is set to allow people to be able to live their lives as they choose. Then along comes the Affordable Care Act, where the government looks down at the people, literally, and says, "I am going to make better decisions for you. Instead of your choosing your doctor, instead of your choosing your hospital, instead of your choosing your insurance, I am going to pick a group of insurance policies and hospitals and doctors I like as the government, and you get to pick from my list." It removes those choices from individuals to then set up a Web site and say, "You are required to go on this Web site and enter your information on this Web site."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't know how you handle shopping online, but when I shop online, I am careful of what Web sites I go to. I want to make sure there are security protocols and there is some backing to that so I am not entering information onto some site where I don't know how the security is handled. But this one is different. On this one, the power of the Federal Government is coming down on an individual to say, "I don't care what you think about the security of this site. Enter your information there, and not only enter your information there, enter your children's information there."

Chief Information Security Officer Teresa Fryer, she is the one who was set to be able to sign off on the security protocols for the Web site when it was to be launched, but in September, she refused to sign off and to put her name onto the exchanges and the data hub and say that it was ready to go and that the security was there. In fact, her statement was that there was a high risk of security and that there had been no end-to-end testing of this site, and she refused to sign off on the security. This is the chief information security officer who was assigned to oversee that for the government. Instead, it was pushed up to Marilyn Tavenner, the Director of CMS, to have to make the signoff because the person under her refused to do it.

Should Americans be concerned in entering their information? Absolutely, they should be concerned in entering their information because there is still no certification that this is fully tested, fully approved and that there are not serious vulnerabilities.

In the first week that the site was launched, the Federal Government brought in what is called a "white hacker," someone who is going to come in and test the system, try to hack into the system. Were they successful? Absolutely, they were successful. They found multiple vulnerabilities in the site, itself, and then reported it back to CMS. There are a lot of security vulnerabilities there.

Is this an issue? Yes, but as ironic as all that is, a government that is set up to serve the people is actually trying to protect itself and not report when there is a problem.

You see, when Target had 40 million credit cards stolen in a very rare incident for a retailer like that—my family's being one of those—we were all notified. We were told, "You are at risk. Here is what has occurred, so go change your credit card. Go protect your identity," because Target has the responsibility to protect us and to be able to let us know you have got a risk.

The Federal Government right now is saying, "If someone breaks into our system, we have the responsibility to protect the Federal Government and not to let anyone know," instead of protecting the individual. That is government on its head. Government is designed to serve and protect the people, not to have them say, "I can't tell you that information because it will look bad for the Federal Government." No.

This bill does a basic thing. It says the people are more important than the program that the government has set up—the people are—and that if their information has been stolen, if there has been a compromise to that information, they should be informed of that so that they can take the steps that are necessary to make sure they and their children who they have entered on their site have their information protected in the days ahead.

This is the right thing to do. This is not some blanket partisan issue. We

would want this in every aspect of every Web site that the Federal Government has, whether that be IRS information, whether that be ObamaCare information, whether that be information on an EPA computer. If it is compromised, that citizen should know so steps can be taken to be able to protect himself. It is a reasonable protection for the American people. That is why I think this is a reasonable thing to be able to do. Quite frankly, we believe that the Affordable Care Act will be completely repealed and that the American people will have the ability to choose for themselves again rather than have the Federal Government say we are going to make choices for you. Until that day comes, it is a reasonable thing to at least begin with this.

With that, I thank the gentlelady from Missouri. Again, I can't root for your football team, but I can stand with you on this issue.

Mrs. WAGNER. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Oklahoma, who is a good friend and leader.

We won't debate the outcome of the Cotton Bowl here in the well of the floor today—that will stand on its own merit—but I do appreciate his leadership on this very important health care issue. I appreciate his leadership on the Republican Policy Committee for our party and the work that he does tirelessly to communicate those in a way that is about serving the people, which is, at the end of the day, why we are here.

Government should be here to serve the people, and we have not put the proper protections in place. What is good enough for the private sector and the States ought to be more than good enough for the Federal Government. Certainly, the American people are worthy of these kinds of protections.

While I will say over and over again that ObamaCare is wrong for the American people—that it is wrong for hard-working Missourians and that it is certainly wrong for the people of the Second District—and that it needs to be replaced immediately before any more harmful provisions are implemented, at the very least, what the government can do is require that we report any security breaches on the ObamaCare Web site to these innocent victims who, through no fault of their own, trusted a government that has once again potentially deceived them.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues again to vote "yes" on this commonsense measure. Tomorrow, let's all stand for the American people and in service to them rather than as a government that is not telling them what is best for them but is truly serving their interests and serving their needs. Please, stand and vote "yes" on the Health Exchange Security and Transparency Act.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

FINDING COMMON GROUND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 30 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the Speaker for his courtesies and the leader for her courtesies for the opportunity to share on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I would offer to say to my colleagues who spoke earlier that we all recognize that the Affordable Care Act has generated opportunities for 9 million Americans, and it is growing. Let's find common ground. We have a law that is legal and affirmed by the United States Supreme Court, but it is affirmed by what is most important: hungry Americans needing good health care to save their lives and the lives of their families.

□ 1900

Frankly, I believe that there needs to be security for all of the Web sites of Federal agencies, rather than have bills that appear to be attacking the Affordable Care Act again, after 46 attempts to repeal it. Let's find a way that we can work together to secure extensively the entire Web sites carefully that are utilized by the Federal Government.

But I have the opportunity and I want to cover, Mr. Speaker, an array of issues that I think are important as we begin this new year. I do want to wish everyone a happy new year. But as I do so, since I come from Houston, and have been a member of the House Science Committee for 12 years before moving to Homeland Security, I want to congratulate NASA and the White House.

First, NASA, for the miraculous and unbelievable space walk just about a week or so ago by two outstanding astronauts. Space walks are not often done. They are much more difficult—in fact, extremely difficult—than one might imagine, as you watched what seemed to be a beautiful effort of activity in space.

I want to congratulate them. That is science. That is genius. That is what these astronauts trained for. They are our neighbors. I was with them over the holiday. I want them to know on the floor of the House that this was outstanding work.

I want to congratulate the White House because, as many of us have advocated over the years, my colleague who is no longer in the House, Congressman Nick Lampson, and myself signed many letters to extend the life of the space station. I am very pleased that it is now to extend the space station for 4 years. I am optimistic when that 4 years is nearing, there will be another assessment that there is more life in the international space station—opportunity for major research, including, when I was on the Science Committee, cancer research in particular, heart disease, stroke, aging. Our

former Senator, John Glenn, took a second ride into space as a member of the United States Senate to test space travel on those who are aging.

Congratulations to NASA and the international space station. It speaks to the genius of America. It speaks to the aspirations and hopes of children around the world. It focuses on the emphasis in the United States on science, technology, engineering, and math, or STEM. Teachers continue to emphasize to our children the importance of those disciplines, and it gives us great hope.

And that is a lot of what I will talk about tonight: hope. For when we think of hope, we must have a broad definition that it includes all Americans. In fact, I believe from the very moment of the dumping of the tea in the Boston Harbor, the Founding Fathers of this Nation, in spite of all of the possible inequities like the holding of slaves, had hope. They left their places of persecution because they had hope.

And we have grown through the ages, from the 1600s, 1700s, 1800s, 1900s, the 20th century, and the 21st century. It has all been around hope. We were hopeful the turn of the century, even as World War I was flaring. We were hopeful even as the 1928–1929 collapse was happening. We were hopeful even with the horrific, heinous acts of World War II, with the interment and the Holocaust. But people were hoping that we would save people and get out of the dastardliness of that.

We were hopeful in the fifties. We as African Americans were hopeful as we marched in the 1950s and 1960s. We were hopeful with the Thurgood Marshall argument before the United States Supreme Court on *Brown v. Board of Education*. We were hopeful.

Now we come to a situation of wealth inequality. We must assure those who fall in that gap of where they are not where they should be, through no fault of their own, but because of this increasing gap.

For example, the wages of those in the top 1 percent—those making \$352,900-plus—their income grew 281 percent from 1979 to 2007. For the bottom 20 percent, their income grew 16 percent, those making less than \$20,000. For those making \$34,000, it grew 23 percent. For those making \$34,000 to \$50,000, 25 percent.

There is wealth inequality in this Nation.

Some would argue some of that is inherited wealth, some of that is capital gains, some of that is stock revenue. It is wealth inequality.

I am moved by the words of Justice Brandeis:

We can either have democracy in this country, or we can have great wealth concentrated in the hands of a few, but we can't have both.

That is not snatching wealth from someone who has worked hard. It is to even up the opportunity for that gap—281 percent growth for the 1 percent, and numbers like 23 and 25 and 38 per-

cent for the working middle class. We need to do better.

And so I think we need to start by stop quarreling about the unemployment benefits extension. We did it under President Bush, with no offsets, and, as well, for about 5 years with President Bush even acknowledging that when people work and invest in this Nation and they fall on bad times, give them a transitional bridge.

Some would say our unemployment is going down. My friends, on the chronically unemployed, it is the highest it has ever been, at 2.6 percent. Now that is growing to 1.3 million in 2013. It will go up to 3.64 million.

So I am not asking for the whole piece. I had a bill that said 1 year. Let's extend it for 3 months on an emergency basis and then begin to discuss how we can fund it.

There are 68,000 jobless workers that are in Texas, and we expect that as it grows in 2014 to 1.9 million and more—as I said 3.6 million and growing—it will be 106,900 Texans.

I have spoken to some of those Texans, and I have heard the stories of a welder who liked his job, was laid off, through no fault of his own, and needs this transitional funding so that he can be presentable for a job. Or a person in technology, administrative assistant, or somebody who worked in home health.

I believe that we have a legitimate basis for the creation of 200,000 jobs—a real dent in the economy and an acknowledgment that the unemployment rate in the United States in 2012 was 8.1 percent. States range from 3.1 percent, to Texas, which is 6.8 percent. Missouri is 6.9 percent. We have 5 percent and 5.7 percent. We have 7 percent in Alaska. Delaware is 7.1 percent. It goes all over the gamut. The individuals are not able to find work because for every job, there are three persons looking.

It generates into inequality of wealth. There is nothing that will refute this except for a transitional hand-up for those unemployed. And, yes, job creation.

My good friends, the Republicans, say they passed a bill on job creation last year. Yes, they did. And we have a bill on job creation, the Jobs bill. That seems to me a compromise in the making. That seems to me an opportunity for us to sit around the table and talk about technology and then talk about other aspects of job creation, because people have to be trained and retrained.

This week I will introduce a bill that is studied not as a bill introduced by a Democrat, but studied for the substance of the bill, called the New Chance for a New Start in Life Act of 2014. This is where you invest in people. It creates an opportunity for someone who is unemployed and still on their unemployment benefit—remember, they have worked and this is unemployment insurance—to get a stipend for certain accredited specific job training that ties to the market.

My friends, all of us are going to say, Well, they are going to take their money and they are going to be on the basket weaving training program; or they are going to take a truck training program, but they have no license. Accredited programs so that person can provide for their family and their training can be paid for.

And we are going to work through accredited social service agencies. We are going to partner with cities and non-profit agencies for apprenticeships and internships. Every job is not an apprenticeship. We want to work with our friends in the trade and the labor community.

Unions have done well for America. Thank you for increasing our minimum wages and conditions in the workforce. Let's find a way to work together, but sometimes it is an internship in an office or an engineering company.

And then we have to provide training and employment enhanced for veterans. There are 22,000 veterans included in that large number of those who are needing transitional funds. We need to work with community colleges and Historically Black Colleges and Hispanic-serving institutions to be able to find a way to get chronically unemployed persons in the workplace, investing, paying taxes, and loving it every moment.

I have talked to folks who said that the most they want for Christmas and the new year is to have the alarm clock go off at 6 a.m. and jump out of bed to go to work. How are we going to cut these people off? What sense does it make?

And then it is important to note that added to the component of problems that we have is that poverty in America still exists. The 49 million poverty rate for African Americans and Hispanics greatly exceeds the national average. In 2010, 27.4 percent of Blacks and 26.6 percent of Hispanics were poor, compared to 9.9 percent of non-Hispanic Whites and 12.1 percent of Asians.

That is not targeting quotas. It is going where the problem is.

You know where else the problem is? Single women of any race, head of households. In 2010, 31.6 percent of households headed by single women were poor, while 15.8 percent of households headed by single men and 6.2 percent of married-couple households are in poverty.

In my district, 18 percent of households in the State of Texas, first in 2009 and 2001, ranked second in the highest rate of food insecurity. In my district, 151,000-plus families live in Poverty.

To the extent that we can't solve that problem, that is not shameful. We have seen the poverty gap close nationwide, even though we know children still live in poverty. President Lyndon Baines Johnson, who spoke on the war on poverty on January 8, said, We must live for hope, as I paraphrase.

And I worked diligently with programs from VISTA to Medicaid to

Medicare to job-training programs to infrastructure programs to programs allowing young people to go to college. I am a witness of all of those programs. Frankly, I worked in the President's summer youth program in the hard rumble area of my youth.

And I have seen Members mention in the last 24 hours how they participated in the same programs. They happen now to be Members of the United States Congress. I would like to know how many Americans would call in the Congress and say, I am a beneficiary of the war on poverty, the Great Society.

Why can't we find common ground to recognize that we can be efficient, but we can also invest in people?

So I raise an ancient philosopher in my remarks on this question:

Any city, however small, is in fact divided into two, one the city of the poor, the other of the rich; these are at war with one another.

Plato said that.

□ 1915

And the question is can we now, in the 21st century, rebut that. Can we find a way to have hopeful people who are poor work with hopeful people who are rich and find a way to enrich both of them, to give them work and to make them shining examples of what America is all about?

Laying that groundwork, I hope my colleagues will join me on the Second Chance Job Act that I have just introduced that will go alongside the kinds of incentives in the jobs bill that President Obama has offered and the bill that was passed here in the House.

Why can't we both be on the same page of caring about getting a bill passed that both bodies will look at favorably, taking pieces? Why can't we get back to legislating again, giving and taking, making amendments, finding out what my friend on the other side of aisle wants, finding out what we want here, having amendments being accepted, making the bill one that is not only through the regular order of the committee, but here on the floor of the House, getting amendments that would satisfy and work with all of us?

I think there is more work to do in many, many areas, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to continue now to be able to offer some of my concerns.

Last evening, on CNN, there was a recounting of a young lady, tragically, who attempted suicide, a young bullying victim, first tragically being raped, not being believed, and ultimately coming forward. I am sort of summarizing the facts. And then because this person was a star athlete in one of the Midwestern States, the town turned on this young girl and her friend, bullying everywhere.

And I think it is time for America and the Congress to make a statement on it, a simple statement. I am not asking for much, but I have introduced H.R. 2585, the Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Reauthorization and the Bullying Prevention and Intervention

Act of 2013. You will be surprised how simple it is:

To be able to allow groups from all over America, 501(c)(3)s that may be under the jurisdiction of faith institutions, youth groups, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, tennis clubs, social service agencies, schools, to put their best practices forward and how they believe they can stem the tide of bullying, what kind of intervention, and add to that, cyber bullying. It also provides for gang prevention programs, turn our children toward socially beneficial pathways.

I had one Member say to me, What would be wrong with the Congress making a unified statement that they want to prevent bullying and they want to intervene?

That is the simple process, four corners of the bill. And research studies have shown that approximately 25 percent of school bullies will be convicted of a criminal offense in their adult years.

I believe in intervention. And I would say to my friends who are experts, all of the advocacy groups, I believe it would be very important if we came together and had this one statement that came out of the Congress, that we want parents and schools and communities and baseball clubs and basketball clubs and football leagues to understand that we have all got to pour our energy into letting children know that to live healthy and free of intimidation is a good thing, that have your fun somewhere else.

I don't know whether bullying led to this absurd game of knockout, but we have got to take a stand alongside of the personal intervention that comes about through the normal community ways.

Just for the record, it is important to note, 30 percent of U.S. students in grades 6 through 10 are involved in moderate or frequent bullying as bullies, victims, or both. According to the results of the first national survey on this subject, bullying is increasingly viewed as an important contributor to youth violence, including homicide and suicide. One out of four kids is bullied. The Justice Department says that in this month, one out of every four kids will be abused by another youth.

Surveys show that 77 percent of students are bullied mentally, verbally, and physically. We have to find a way to make a national statement. What better way than a Congress that is the symbol of the most powerful Nation in the world and the most powerful law-making body.

Why is it so difficult to pass something as simple as that?

It does not stop us from looking down the future when we have many more resources to deal with to put a huge amount of funding in it once best practices—once we give the spark plug and get people excited about our Federal Government is concerned about this, let's look for enhanced best practices. Let's make a statement on this,

which I think is enormously important.

I want to quickly, and I hope, as we debate these issues on the floor, that there will be Members who will want to have a conversation. I want to say, as well, that many of us have experienced violence in our communities. I am going to discuss that a little later, but I want to say it now. I have had a number of incidences of violence, through knives, through guns, in my own school districts in Houston.

Even though we know that does not define our school districts, I say to them, when you have an incident like that, it is not a reflection on you, but it is a signal and a sign that the community must come together. We will look forward in Houston to putting together a Stop Violence Commission under the 18th Congressional District, bringing people from the faith community, bringing other leaders, working with the Mothers Demand Action, MDA, who have come out every moment to stop gun violence, working with mothers and fathers who have had to bury their children, funerals that I attended over the holiday or before that time frame. I want to tell that mother whose son's funeral that I attended, I have not forgotten. We will embrace you, and we will find a way that we can sit together and make a difference.

Let me switch now for a moment—I will come back to that issue—and remind us of the humanity of comprehensive immigration reform. I said that I had any number of issues that I think are weighing on many of us as Members of Congress, weighing on those of us who are doers and want to do, and I would venture to say that that is this entire body. But we are getting stalled, and for what reason, I don't know.

But my hometown paper was eager to review H.R. 1417, which is a bipartisan product that has come out of the Subcommittee on Border Security and Maritime Security, my colleague from Michigan, and out of the full committee, with the chairman and ranking member of the full committee, a bill that has now been joined under H.R. 15, to put a bill forward in the House.

And I would just ask, why can't we end the suffering of so many, end the divide and deportation of so many families, in the thousands, and begin to look, as the faith community and business community, educational community, health community, research community, business community wants us to do?

Comprehensive immigration reform, Texas is a prime example: 16.4 percent of Texans are foreign born; 42 percent are Latino or Asian; 33.2 percent of immigrants in the State are naturalized U.S. citizens; 11.8 percent are registered voters or new Americans; 87.7 percent of children with immigrant parents are U.S. citizens; 75 percent of children with immigrant parents are English proficient; 70 percent of naturalized citizens have a high school di-

ploma; 61,511 foreign students contribute \$1.4 billion to the State economy, and they make up 21 percent of the workforce; 9 percent of the workforce is unauthorized.

We need to get people from underneath the underground economy. We need families able to walk the streets together, mothers not being dragged out of homes. We need the DREAM Act children to be able to raise their heads as U.S. citizens. We need access to citizenship.

This coming Monday, I will gather at Catholic Charities with people from all over the community in Houston, Texas, and we will be standing together, raising our voices as humane Americans. We will be speaking about Latinos and Asians. We will be speaking about Africans. We will be speaking about people from the Caribbean, people from Europe, people from Canada, people from Ireland. We will be speaking about people from all over the world that happen to be in Houston, Texas.

It is time to pass comprehensive immigration reform and pass it now.

I mentioned very quickly that I would be going through a number of issues, but let me just turn to the issue of guns.

Let me pause for a moment and find out how much time I have, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mrs. JACKSON LEE. Let me quickly mention that we must stop the violence of guns. When we think about 5,740 children being killed by guns, I would like, again, for this Congress to look at H.R. 2812, which is a bill that deals with stand your ground that we have not addressed from the Trayvon Martin case.

And I would like them, also, to quickly look at gun safety and gun access prevention, H.R. 65. I find that a way of being able to come together and keeping guns out of the hands of underage children and teaching gun safety to parents and children.

I want to also join with my colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee and mention human trafficking is a major issue. It will be commemorated on January 11, but I will be hosting, with the Homeland Security Committee, a hearing on human trafficking in Houston, Texas.

Quickly, I want to make mention of the Congressional Gold Medal that I have for Malala, who is a voice of strength, a young teenager gunned and shot—I wouldn't say gunned down because she lives in Pakistan, only because she wanted girls to have education.

I ask my colleagues to join myself and ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN to insure that we do have, if you will, the honor of presenting this to her, nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize, spoke before the United Nations, and I hope that we will do that.

Let me close, Mr. Speaker, by mentioning two quick things, and that is,

let us not forget our veterans, enormously important, and let us also move quickly for NSA reforms.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee that helped write the Patriot Act, section 215, that was not our interpretation. That was not legislative history for trolling mega-data collection. We can be safe and secure, and we will be presenting a briefing on privacy and security next week in the Judiciary Committee, 2226, at 10:30. I hope all of the colleagues will come.

But I have introduced legislation to make sure that there is a people's advocate in the FISA Court, but more importantly, that we restrain and find a way to restrain the mega-collection. And I hope the President, in the reports that he has just received, will be able to do that as well.

Let me also indicate that internationally, I think this Congress should deal with where we are in Syria and where we were in South Sudan, two places that I am concerned about, the human cost, if you will.

We have a lot to do, Mr. Speaker. I just gave just small bits this evening, but we have a lot to do that we can do together in a bipartisan manner.

And we can look at the Affordable Care Act, just as a point, in closing, because it has been so divisive, and look at it that it is working. People want insurance. We can do that, and we can make sure that, as we do so, Mr. Speaker, then America will see us working together. That is what I would like to see happening.

I have given an array of an agenda that touches the lives of people. Let's get to work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1930

CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION TO THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) for 30 minutes.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As always, it is a privilege to be able to come to the great well of the House of Representatives, the greatest deliberative body in the history of the world, to be here and have an opportunity to bring a voice to the table and to speak to the American people as well as my constituents in the Sixth District of Minnesota.

I want to join my colleagues in wishing a happy New Year to all the people in the United States. We look forward to a wonderful year in 2014. There are so many things that are good that we can look forward to this year, so many things that this body can get done, that we can agree on.

We can agree on our veterans, standing for them, thanking them, first of all, that tonight, as we are here in this Chamber, we have men and women

across the globe who are laying their lives on the line for us. Our prayers are with you, and our prayers are with your families.

So, Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak for you and for all of our colleagues, that we want to let our troops know, there is nothing more important than the work that you do to secure our liberty and our freedom. We are for you, and we will be standing here for you this year, as we have in the past.

We also stand together in recognition that the first and greatest obligation of all of us, as Members of Congress in this Chamber, is to secure the safety and security of the American people, the welfare of the American people, Mr. Speaker. We do that here domestically, but our obligation is to make sure that our national security is held safe here in the homeland but also our vital American national security interests across the globe.

To that end, several of my colleagues and myself took a fact-finding trip in December. After we had concluded our work in December, we went into the Middle East. We took a very extensive journey. This was no pleasure trip in any way. This was a working mission. We went first into Amsterdam. While we were there, we met an individual who has one of the most extensive collections of communist penetration throughout the world. It was interesting, as we dialogued with him about communist infiltration, what that has meant over the course of history, particularly over the last century, and what that means for Americans today.

From there, we journeyed into Cairo, Egypt. While we were there, we spoke with leaders of Egypt. There has been a tremendous change that has occurred, and we know that literally in just over a week's time, people in Egypt will have an opportunity to go to the ballot box and vote in a referendum on a brand-new Constitution.

A very brief recent history of Egypt is that there was an overthrow in Egypt of the Mubarak presidency, which had been stable for some 30-plus years. The people of Egypt spoke. They were very unhappy with their government. There was a referendum that had occurred, and during that time, the Muslim Brotherhood came to power through the president, President Morsi. The Muslim Brotherhood, through the Freedom and Justice Party, established a new regime.

So repulsed were the people of Egypt by the Muslim Brotherhood and their tactics during the course of just something over a year that the people of Egypt took to the streets, some 33 million people in what some people say was the largest human demonstration ever in the history of the world because the people of Egypt were outraged at the atrocities and the extremism of the Muslim Brotherhood as they were displayed across Egypt.

Really, so much of this so-called Arab Spring has been the persecution of Christians, religious minorities, and

women, particularly in the Middle East region. Nowhere has this been felt more than in Egypt, and the people rose up.

You see, in the Egyptian Constitution, which was put together by the Muslim Brotherhood, there was no avenue for the people to remove the Muslim Brotherhood president, President Morsi. There was no impeachment process like we have in the United States. The only option available to the people was to go into the streets and demonstrate and seek the removal of the Muslim Brotherhood president. That is what the people effectuated.

In that time, there is now an interim president. His name is President Mansour. I met with him numerous times in Cairo. We have had very good conversations with interim President Mansour. He told me in Egypt, together with my colleagues, that he would not be seeking reelection. We also met with General el-Sisi, the head of the military in Egypt, trying to maintain order in that country.

We heard some very good news, and, Mr. Speaker, among the news that we heard while we were in Egypt was this: Egypt enjoys the most favorable relationship with the Jewish State of Israel that they have had in over 35 years. The Obama administration asked Egypt to work harder in the Sinai. That is the border, Mr. Speaker, between Egypt and Israel.

The Obama administration asked the Egyptian Government to work to clear out al Qaeda and to try to secure that border. You see, Mr. Speaker, the Muslim Brotherhood, instead, had been placing more attacks through using al Qaeda and al Qaeda elements in various flavors. When you think of the old phrase of Baskin-Robbins and its 28 flavors of ice cream, there are multiple flavors, if you will, Mr. Speaker, of al Qaeda. There is the Al-Nusra Front. There is Jemaah Islamiyah. There is one organization after another, but they share the same ideology.

Much of this ideology makes its way through an organization called the Muslim Brotherhood, and the Muslim Brotherhood was actively facilitating attacks on Israel through tunnels ruled by Hamas, which is essentially another affiliate, a franchise of the Muslim Brotherhood in the Gaza region. So whether it was weapons, whether it was attacks, whether it was fighters, Israel had its hands full in the Sinai border.

Now the good news is that General el-Sisi, interim President Mansour in Egypt took to heart the request from the Obama administration and, for their own survival, worked to take apart the al Qaeda network and the strength that there was of jihadist-based fighters on the Sinai, and they have been incredibly successful.

I am pleased to report to you tonight, Mr. Speaker, that what we heard from the leadership in Egypt was that over 70 percent of the jihadist activity on the Sinai has been silenced, deconstructed, taken apart. That

means that Israel has had a better time, a more peaceful time on its border, but also, this has helped the Egyptian Government as well.

The Nile River in Egypt is kind of a dividing point. You have western Egypt. You have eastern Egypt, eastern Egypt being the more violent, where it has been essentially a "wild west," if you will, in the Sinai. It has been very difficult for securing peace in the Middle East, very difficult for Israel, but we have to thank the current interim government, under the leadership of President Mansour and under the guidance of General el-Sisi in the Sinai region. That is the good news. Of all of the turmoil and all of the chaos that there is today in the Middle East, this is our bright and shining spot.

The United States, in my opinion, needs to do everything that we can to encourage and foster peace in this region. As I believe that my colleagues, whether it is on the Democrat side, on the Republican side, whether it is in the House, whether it is in the Senate, this is something that we agree upon. We want to see peace in the Middle East, peace in the largest Arab country in the Middle East, which would be Egypt, but also peace in the Jewish State of Israel, and this is the place to forge that peace.

The good news is to hear that on this very sensitive border, we are seeing the Egyptians working together to make sure that there can be peace to fight a common enemy, and that would be al Qaeda and the radical elements in this regime. That is good news.

We went from Cairo, Egypt, where we heard very good news from General el-Sisi, very good news from Amr Moussa, who is heading the Committee of 50 which is writing the new Constitution that the people of Egypt will be voting on in the referendum on January 14 and January 15. I believe the people of Egypt will see the wisdom in this new Constitution which, by the way, Mr. Speaker, does have a provision for impeachment so that the people in Egypt in the future will have an opportunity to be able to change their President and their country. They also guarantee the freedom of belief in Egypt, and they have a dedication to rebuilding the houses of worship that were destroyed by the Muslim Brotherhood.

The Muslim Brotherhood destroyed shops, homes, and places of worship of Coptic Christians in Egypt. The government is committed to rebuilding the Christian houses of worship in Egypt. This is a wonderful advancement for peace and for tolerance in that region of the world, and one that I think we should encourage and get behind.

From there, my colleagues and I, in a delegation which was led by Representative STEVE KING of Iowa—also in attendance was Representative LOUIE GOHMERT of Texas and also Representative ROBERT PITTENGER of North Carolina—from there, we went on to Beirut,

Lebanon, which has been a hotbed of violence because Iran has seen an avenue of advancement. Working through the terrorist organization Hezbollah, Iran has been bringing increased terror between Sunni and Shia in southern Lebanon.

We flew into the airport at Beirut. The airport at Beirut is controlled by Hezbollah. There, we met with the ambassador. We met with leaders of political parties. It is devastating to hear what they have to say about the increased violence.

A suicide bomber wearing a vest detonated that vest during our time when we were there. Obviously we weren't anywhere nearby. We weren't in any form of danger, but a vest was detonated. Four people were killed. Also, a soldier had shot into Israel and had killed an Israeli soldier during the time that we were there. There has been a very, very strong, increase in violence. Violence occurred prior to our entry. Violence continues to occur, and there are now new reports, Mr. Speaker, of Iran bringing even more dangerous, larger deadly weapons into that area, again, bringing to the fore the increase in fighting between Sunni and Shia.

That is the kind of pressure that the Jewish State of Israel is looking at on its northern border, without even contemplating what is happening in Syria.

Syria, Mr. Speaker, has completely fallen apart. It is in complete chaos now, with Assad having estimated to have killed over 200,000 of his own people. Now the so-called moderates who were being backed, led by General Idris—General Idris has now, reportedly, left Syria, and the extremist elements, including al Qaeda, of the Islamist jihadist regime are now fighting against Assad.

So we have two very bad options in Syria today, and very recently, these Islamist jihadist fighters took over a weapons cache of very dangerous weapons, and they now have control of those weapons.

Where do we go from here in Syria? It is a very, very difficult question.

We have such utter chaos that Lebanon now is the recipient of the greatest number of Syrian refugees on a daily basis. So we have the tension of Palestinian refugees who have gone into Lebanon. We have Iran, which has its presence through Hezbollah, the terrorist organization, very agitated. Some estimates are that as many as 100,000 missiles are located in people's homes, in schools, in nurseries, in nursing homes, embedded in civilian areas right on Israel's northern border. There is an utter and complete breakdown and chaos in Syria.

Then you have all of the tension in Iraq, with increasing battles going on, again, between Sunni and Shia in Iraq. Iraq at one point had been fairly close to being secured by an American presence. It is has now utterly fallen apart.

There continue to be attacks by the Taliban. A new report just came in

that the Taliban, presumably, is responsible for six Americans who were killed in December. We have Karzai, the head of Afghanistan, who is not willing to agree to final settlement terms in Afghanistan to have aid and U.S. presence, despite the fact that the United States supplies something like 95 percent of the economy in Afghanistan. This is the thanks we are getting out of Afghanistan.

We have that kind of tension and pressure together with numerous prisons where the worst of the worst Islamist thug al Qaeda-flavored jihadists have been let out of prisons and are going into Syria. From Syria, who knows where, again, adding to the pressure on Israel. At the same time, we have what, in my mind, was the very dangerous P5+1 agreement dealing with Iran and dealing with trying to prevent or at least stop or at least freeze in place Iran's nuclear program, which all of the world knows will be meant to give Iran a nuclear weapon and the missile delivery systems capable of delivering those weapons against Israel, against Western Europe, and against the United States.

□ 1945

This is the greatest threat that the world faces today: a nuclear Iran. And even while we are here in this Chamber tonight, Mr. Speaker, many people think that the 6-month freeze is on tonight, that when President Obama went to the microphone—it was about a little after 10 o'clock at night on a Saturday night—to announce with vigor that we had concluded this agreement with Iran and we will now have a 6-month freeze, that 6-month period hasn't even started yet. No one knows when that 6-month period of a so-called freeze will even start.

So, Mr. Speaker, what I'm saying, quite frankly, is that as we are standing in this Chamber tonight, Iran continues to enrich uranium for a nuclear weapon. They are enriching it to 20 percent. That is not a small amount. It may sound small. That is a huge leap towards weapons grade uranium. They continue to install centrifuges. They have new-generation centrifuges that can spin to enrich uranium six times faster than the current generation.

Iran hasn't given up one ounce of its storage of enriched uranium. They haven't stopped their research and development on their delivery systems of their missiles. They haven't stopped research and development on the warheads that would go on the tips of missiles to deliver a nuclear bomb. They haven't stopped the production on the facility of plutonium at Arak. That continues going on. Nothing has stopped.

In fact, the only thing we have heard from Iran is from the Iranian leadership. The Parliament has said, why don't we start enriching to 60 percent? You see, weapons grade is 80 percent. Why don't we up it even further? That is what the Parliament is saying today

after the agreement was signed. The mullahs, the religious leaders that effectively control Iran, are saying that this agreement means nothing to them. As a matter of fact, the leader of Iran said that they won't change one iota of their nuclear program. You see, it is very interesting. I think that when madmen speak, the world should listen, and Iran is acting in a way that is indicative of the madman of all time.

Currently, Iran's plan is to have domination across the world by the use of nuclear weapons to wipe millions of innocent people off the map, beginning with the Jewish State of Israel. You see, about 80 percent of the people that live in Israel travel to the greater Tel Aviv area for their employment. It doesn't take much imagination to see how easy it would be for Iran to send multiple nuclear missiles and virtually wipe out the Jewish State of Israel.

But let us never think as Iran calls Israel the Little Satan, Iran calls the United States the Great Satan—and we should never delude ourselves to think that this is a Middle East-only problem. It isn't, Mr. Speaker. I wish I could say it was. This is a problem the world must deal with.

During the course of our travels in December for the week that we were in the Middle East, we were very disturbed by what we heard from various leaders. As a matter of fact, there was one leader that we met with in Lebanon during our time there in that very dangerous area—it was so dangerous, as a matter of fact, that this leader about a year earlier had been shot. There were three snipers—he pointed over a wall. They had to build a wall around his house. He is now confined to his house, in the compound around his house. It is too dangerous for him to even leave. There were three snipers about a mile away that took a shot at him while he was in his backyard. He almost lost his life, and now he is confined to his backyard.

This is what he had to say to us, Mr. Speaker, when they were there. He told us that, unfortunately, in the last 2 to 3 years, there has been virtually no U.S. leadership in the Middle East. That is reminiscent of what we heard the former leader, Lech Walesa, of Poland tell the world, that the United States is no longer the political leader nor the moral leader of the world, that we have effectively walked off the world stage and that the world needs the leadership of the United States. We heard that repeated by this leader in Lebanon.

He also told us that the opinion of the United States has gone down dramatically in the Middle East. He said he has a brother who is in the United States, and it has been a shock for his brother, a very intelligent individual in the United States, a shock to see how the United States has failed to respond to the rise of Islamic jihadist activity in the Middle East and how it is negatively impacting United States national security. He said there is no

strategy; there is no outlook. It seems to be that the United States just acts day to day—no strategy.

Shouldn't our strategy be the security and safety of the American people? Shouldn't our strategy—shouldn't our aim be securing American vital interests in the Middle East, standing with the best ally we have in the world, the Jewish State of Israel? And yet the Middle East doesn't have any idea what our strategy is because they are telling us it looks like it is ad hoc, day to day. He said, I'm telling you this as a friend. He said that prior there were no Russians in the Middle East, no Russian influence and presence. He said that now the Russians have strengthened and have a very strong presence in the Middle East. He said it has been very frustrating in the last 2 or 3 years.

He said the Arabians have long been our friends, friends of the United States. But the Saudi Arabians, he said, no longer seem to trust the United States. He said the P5+1 agreement has made Iran stronger than ever before. And he told us that Iran is Hezbollah, and so he is facing things from Hezbollah every day. He said that there is more money available for Hezbollah because we have decreased, we have essentially lifted sanctions on Iran. All this has done is free up money so more money can go to the terrorist organization Hezbollah in Lebanon, and that is being used to hurt Israel, as well.

Well, whether it is Syria, whether it is Iraq, whether it is Bahrain, whether it is Saudi Arabia, all of these countries are wondering what in the world the United States is doing. Because what they are saying to us is that things are much worse on the ground in the Middle East. As the Iranians have only turned their burner off temporarily, they can turn it back on again. I quote from him, This makes Iran stronger than ever, stronger in the Middle East.

That is what we heard, Mr. Speaker, on the ground from leaders in Lebanon that Iran has been strengthened through this failed P5+1 agreement.

From Lebanon, Mr. Speaker, we went down to Tripoli, Libya, to get some answers on Benghazi and get some answers on what the P5+1 agreement will mean in Libya. Well, we spoke with the Prime Minister in Libya; we spoke with leaders of the Justice Department and the foreign minister, as well. I asked them specifically about Benghazi. I asked them why was our FBI prevented from going into Libya—specifically to Benghazi—to conduct an investigation for 4 or 5 weeks after the terrible tragedy on September 11? And the response that we received was that this was a great insult to Libya when this attack occurred and that this was an attack against Libya and the Libyan people.

Now, this compound that was attacked in Benghazi is considered sovereign American soil. When Chris Stevens, our Ambassador, was killed and

the three other Americans—brave Americans—were killed, this was an attack on America, on our compound, on our Ambassador and on our American soldiers. This was an attack against us—not on Libya—against us. There was absolutely no reason why the Libyan Government prevented our FBI from coming in on our sovereign territory and conducting an investigation.

Journalists were inside. We know that CNN picked up the Ambassador's diaries and walked out with the Ambassador's diaries. Other sensitive information was on the ground and people came in and walked away with it. But the FBI couldn't get in? This is the only Ambassador in 30 years to be killed, and we couldn't get in to find out what in the world happened, ask people and figure out what is going on? It has been over a year. We still don't know who, what, where, when, how, why, and how much were we prevented from knowing, because we were kept out of that country by over 4 and 5 weeks. It was wrong. And I told that to the leadership in Libya when we were there. It was wrong. That needs to be rectified. We demand and we expect full cooperation in getting to the bottom of Benghazi. That must be done, and that is a bipartisan issue. That is not a partisan issue.

Well, from Libya, we traveled up to Israel where we met with Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, the defense secretary. We were extremely grateful for the time we had there. Again, there is no question, the Prime Minister, Benjamin Netanyahu, told us, that it was the worst day in 10 years when the P5+1 agreement was struck—the worst day in 10 years. No one will be more negatively impacted by a nuclear Iran than the Jewish State of Israel.

Wouldn't you think it would be wise for the United States and for the great nations of the world to listen to the concerns of the land that is on the slaughtering block when they say, wait a minute, this is the worst thing we could do, the P5+1 agreement, because this will not prevent, this will not stop Iran from getting a nuclear bomb? That was confirmed on this most recent trip when we were with the Prime Minister. He is very concerned about that.

He is also very concerned about the International Criminal Court, as well, and the fact that Israel will soon be drawn into the Criminal Court. There could be actions taking the United States in. We want to be under U.S. law. And we need to maintain the United States as a sovereign Nation and our American people subject only to United States sovereign law. We don't want the American people subject to some international court. The American people must now and for always only be subject to the American courts because only here will we be allowed to enjoy the protections under the Constitution that we have today. That will not happen under the International Criminal Court.

From Israel, we traveled and went on up to Vienna where we met with the International Atomic Energy Agency. This agency is tasked with overseeing the P5+1 agreement with Iran. We appreciated our time in Vienna; we appreciated being able to speak with those who were present to talk about the process, what they will do. But I will tell you, on behalf of my colleagues, we didn't leave with a sense that we could have complete trust in knowing that the IAEA, while they will perform their jobs, that they will be able to completely appreciate when and if Iran decides to move into the creation of a nuclear weapon. That is something that we can't get wrong. Where do we go if that is wrong?

Mr. Speaker, if I could ask how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time is expired.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Well, I thank you. I appreciate that, and thank you for allowing me time to relate some of my concerns that we heard on our recent trip to the Middle East.

OMISSION FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 8, 2014 AT PAGE H62

THE CLASS OF 2006 FONDLY PAYS TRIBUTE TO GABBY GIFFORDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the colleagues that have joined me today for our 30-minute Special Order, and this is a special Special Order.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A Bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1171. An act to amend the Controlled Substances Act to allow a veterinarian to transport and dispense controlled substances in the usual course of veterinary practice outside of the registered location; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce; in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 667. An act to redesignate the Dryden Flight Research Center as the Neil A. Armstrong Flight Research Center and the Western Aeronautical Test Range as the Hugh L. Dryden Aeronautical Test Range.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 10, 2014, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4401. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; North Carolina: Non-interference Demonstration for Removal of Federal Low-Reid Vapor Pressure Requirement of the Raleigh-Durham-Chapel Hill Area [EPA-R04-OAR-2013-0563; FRL-9904-89-Region 4] received December 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4402. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Texas; Reasonable Further Progress Plans, Contingency Measures, Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets, and a Vehicle Miles Traveled Offset Analysis for the Houston-Galveston-Brazoria 1997 8-Hour Severe Ozone Nonattainment Area [EPA-R06-OAR-2010-0333; FRL-9904-72-Region-6] received December 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4403. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Update of the Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets for the Lancaster 1997 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0058; FRL-9904-49-Region-3] received December 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4404. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Third Rule Implementing Export Control Reform (RIN: 1400-AD46) received January 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4405. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-247, "Controlled Substance, Alcohol Testing, Criminal Background Check and Background Investigation Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4406. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-248, "Distillery Pub Licensure Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4407. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-249, "Campaign Finance Reform and Transparency Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4408. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-251, "Manufacturers' Sunday Sale Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4409. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-232, "Prescription Drug Monitoring Program Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4410. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-234, "Transportation Infrastructure Mitigation Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4411. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-233, "YMCA Community Investment Initiative Real Property Tax Exemption Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4412. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-236, "Department of Health Grant-Making Authority for Clinical Nutritional Home Services Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4413. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-235, "Transportation Infrastructure Improvements GARVEE Bond Financing Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4414. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-238, "Party Officer Elections Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4415. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-237, "Critical Infrastructure Freedom of Information Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4416. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-240, "Board of Elections Nomination Petition Circulator Affidavit Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4417. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-239, "Department of Corrections Central Cellblock Management Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4418. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-241, "Board of Ethics and Government Accountability Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4419. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-242, "Patent and Student Empowerment Amendment Act of

2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4420. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-250, "Prohibition on Government Employee Engagement in Political Activity Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4421. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-252, "Manufacturer Tasting Permit Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4422. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-253, "Funeral and Memorial Service Leave Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4423. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-254, "Focused Student Achievement Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4424. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-255, "Tax Clarity Equity Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4425. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-256, "Historic Music Cultural Institutions Expansion Tax Abatement Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4426. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-257, "Fair Student Funding and School-Based Budgeting Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4427. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-258, "Closing of a Portion of the Public Alley in Square 858, S.O. 12-03336, Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4428. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-259, "Earned Sick and Safe Leave Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4429. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-260, "Tax Exemption for Teacher Awards Temporary Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of January 4, 2014]

Mr. CONWAY: Committee on Ethics. Annual Report on the Activities of the Committee on Ethics for the One Hundred Thirtieth Congress, First Session (Rept. 113-323). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 2952. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make certain improvements in the laws relating to the advancement of security technologies for critical infrastructure protection, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-324). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. TIERNEY (for himself, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. HORSFORD, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK):

H.R. 3824. A bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SIREs, and Ms. HAHN):

H.R. 3825. A bill to establish the National Freight Mobility Infrastructure Improvement Program to improve freight mobility in the United States, to establish the National Freight Mobility Infrastructure Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BARR, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. BARTON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. DAINES, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. ENYART, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HALL, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LATTa, Mr. LONG, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. PITTS, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIBERI, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana):

H.R. 3826. A bill to provide direction to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency regarding the establishment of standards for emissions of any greenhouse gas from fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3827. A bill to prohibit the United States from providing financial assistance to Benin until Mr. Mojaidou Soumanou is released from prison; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3828. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, to draft disclosures describing the rights and liabilities of

customers of domestic care services and require that such services provide such disclosures to customers in any contract for such services; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WEBER of Texas (for himself, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. HALL, Mr. CARTER, Mr. YOHo, Mr. FLORES, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LATTa, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. CULBERSON, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida):

H.R. 3829. A bill to amend chapter 1 of title 1, United States Code, with regard to the definition of "marriage" and "spouse" for Federal purposes and to ensure respect for State regulation of marriage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. NUNES):

H.R. 3830. A bill to establish congressional trade negotiating objectives and enhanced consultation requirements for trade negotiations, to provide for consideration of trade agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 3831. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to review the dialysis pilot program implemented by the Department of Veterans Affairs and submit a report to Congress before expanding that program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 3832. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modify the surety bond requirement applicable to home health agencies as a condition of participation under Medicare; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 3833. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modify the Medicare durable medical equipment face-to-face encounter documentation requirement; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 3834. A bill to ensure that certain communities may be granted exceptions for floodproofed residential basements for purposes of determining risk premium rates for flood insurance; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 3835. A bill to require new procedures for health care Exchange Web sites with regard to personal information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee (for himself, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 3836. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Pat Summitt, in recognition of her remarkable career as an unparalleled figure in women's team sports, and for her courage in speaking out openly and courageously about her battle with Alzheimer's; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mr. ENYART, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mrs. WAGNER):

H.R. 3837. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to protect employees in the building and construction industry who are participants in multiemployer plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 3838. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a consumer renewable credit for utilities that sell intermittent renewable power; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 3839. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a grant program to assist the repair and replacement of bridges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 3840. A bill to establish the Office of Net Assessment within the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida (for himself, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. YOHo, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. MICA, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. RADEL, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GARCIA, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.J. Res. 105. A joint resolution conferring honorary citizenship of the United States on Bernardo de Gálvez y Madrid, Viscount of Galveston and Count of Gálvez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. FARR, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. PETERS of California):

H. Con. Res. 73. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued by the United States Postal Service honoring the 1915 Panama-California Exposition, and that the Citizens Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that such a stamp be issued; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers

granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. TIERNEY:

H.R. 3824.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 3825.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 3—"To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and within the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 3826.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3827.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3828.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clauses 3 and 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. WEBER of Texas:

H.R. 3829.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, which states that "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;" and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution, which states that Congress shall have power "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 3830.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 3831.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as stated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 3832.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 3833.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 3834.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 1; and Article 1, section 8, clause 3.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 3835.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 3836.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 3837.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I submit the following statement regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution of the United States to enact the accompanying bill cited as the "Vested Employee Pension Benefit Protection Act."

The Constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises to pay the debts and provide for the common Defense and general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. Additionally, Congress has the Constitutional authority to regulate commerce among the States and with Indian Tribes, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 3838.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 3839.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of the Constitution—to regulate Commerce.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 3840.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution. "The Congress shall have Power . . . To declare War . . ." and "To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces."

This bill would establish an independent organization within the Department of Defense to develop and coordinate net assessments of the military capabilities of the United States compared to potential adversaries in order to identify emerging threats or opportunities. Congressional authority to establish such an office falls within two clauses of Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, which give Congress the specific power "To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces," and, more generally, "To declare War." The organization that would be established by this bill is a function of the "Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces" and Congressional power to declare war.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.J. Res. 105.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. COTTON, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 60: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 140: Mr. HALL.

H.R. 164: Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 176: Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 310: Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 543: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 556: Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 685: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 946: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 975: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 1010: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. LOWEY, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 1094: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 1098: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1143: Mr. COLE and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 1179: Mr. McHENRY and Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 1186: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 1213: Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 1309: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 1476: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 1507: Ms. HAHN and Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 1518: Mr. McKEON and Mr. MICA.

H.R. 1563: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1692: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1717: Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 1750: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 1761: Ms. MATSUI and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 1796: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 1801: Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 1812: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1852: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 1861: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 1946: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1950: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 2085: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 2300: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 2305: Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 2444: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 2455: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 2482: Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 2560: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 2590: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 2694: Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 2703: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 2717: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 2725: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 2734: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 2780: Mr. McCAUL.

H.R. 2785: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 2801: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2827: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2868: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 2893: Ms. HAHN.

H.R. 2909: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 2914: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 2955: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2994: Mr. WILLIAMS, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 2998: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 3040: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 3097: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 3111: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 3121: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 3154: Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 3207: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 3211: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 3279: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H.R. 3303: Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 3335: Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 3344: Mr. MESSER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. VELA, and Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 3362: Mr. LATTA and Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 3367: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 3377: Mr. COTTON and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 3390: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 3404: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 3413: Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 3421: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 3436: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 3453: Mr. KILMER and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 3461: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 3465: Mr. GIBSON.
 H.R. 3478: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mrs. LUMMIS.
 H.R. 3485: Mr. STUTZMAN.
 H.R. 3486: Mr. STOCKMAN.
 H.R. 3530: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
 H.R. 3546: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
 H.R. 3633: Mr. HUDSON.
 H.R. 3635: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MICA, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARR, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MESSER, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. POSEY.
 H.R. 3649: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
 H.R. 3685: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. HIGGINS, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, and Mr. PITTINGER.
 H.R. 3686: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. BARR.
 H.R. 3708: Mr. KLINE, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. SCHRADER.
 H.R. 3712: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 3717: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. ROSKAM.
 H.R. 3724: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
 H.R. 3726: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. DINGELL.
 H.R. 3731: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 3732: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. BARTON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Ms. GRANGER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. RADEL, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. SALMON.
 H.R. 3747: Mr. CLAY and Mr. MEEHAN.
 H.R. 3755: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
 H.R. 3780: Ms. TSONGAS.
 H.R. 3787: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. PITTINGER, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
 H.R. 3790: Mr. HARPER.
 H.R. 3808: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
 H.R. 3811: Mr. YOHIO.
 H.R. 3819: Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HURT, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. NUNNELEE.
 H. Res. 11: Mr. CICILLINE.
 H. Res. 72: Mr. CICILLINE.
 H. Res. 97: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. MCKINLEY.
 H. Res. 135: Mr. HANNA.
 H. Res. 153: Mr. LATTA.
 H. Res. 425: Mr. COTTON.
 H. Res. 436: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. TIERNEY.
 H. Res. 440: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. VELA, Mr. LANDEVIN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. TIERNEY,

Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. HANABUSA, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. HONDA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BASS, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. WATERS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. COSTA, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H. Res. 442: Mr. BARTON, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. FLORES, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

67. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Municipal Legislature of Aguada, Puerto Rico, relative to Resolution No. 19 requesting that the President grant immediate and unconditional freedom to Oscar Lopez Rivera; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.